MONO COUNTY GENERAL PLAN DRAFT EIR

SECTION 4.2

REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN & CIRCULATION

4.2.1 INTRODUCTION AND SUMMARY

The Mono County Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) is a long-range regional mobility plan that provides a blueprint for achieving a coordinated and multi-modal circulation system throughout Mono County. Although State Planning and Zoning Law as well as transportation planning laws require the County to adopt both a Circulation Element and an RTP, the two documents fulfill closely related goals and objectives, and the core policies can be combined into a single document for adoption by the Local Transportation Commission (LTC) and by the county Board of Supervisors. In Mono County, the RTP has been adopted as the Circulation Element. The plan establishes strategies for addressing mobility needs, and a basis for making decisions concerning future transportation investments. To this end, the RTP transportation directives include:

- Correlate development of the transportation and circulation system with land use development;
- Offer a transportation and circulation system that responds to economic constraints and opportunities;
- Set forth a sustainable and environmentally responsible circulation plan providing access to community, economic, recreational and scenic resources;
- Ensure that the transportation system will meet Mono County air quality goals and standards;
- Emphasize routes that promote livable communities and complete streets, while maintaining efficient traffic flow, emergency access and alternative transportation modes;
- Improve countywide circulation to safely meet long-range travel demand at acceptable levels of service;
- Provide for the use of non-motorized transportation throughout Mono County;
- Provide for the parking needs of residents and visitors, particularly in community areas;
- Provide for the safe, efficient, and economical operation of existing airports in Mono County;
- Ensure that Mono County RTP components are consistent with State and Federal goals and programs; and
- Incorporate community-based public participation that reflect consensus regarding RTP components.

Information for this section is drawn from the *Draft Mono County RTP* prepared through collaboration of the Mono County LTC, Mono County Community Development Department, and Town of Mammoth Lakes Community Development Department. This section also incorporates and responds to NOP comments received from Caltrans, including information provided by Caltrans about state requirements for updating the RTP, consideration of State Scenic Highway requirements when formulating communications policies for utilities such as towers and fiber-optic cables, the role of partnerships and MOUs in achieving transportation project goals, consideration of specific roadway conditions when establishing parking standards and policies, ensuring Caltrans' involvement when developing Safety Element policies that require use of State Highways, consideration of the multiple roles of Mono County main streets, and recommendations that Mono County consider preparation of a multi-modal plan and use of mitigation banking to address transportation project impacts. Caltrans also expressed support for repeal of the Conway Ranch Specific Plan (noted herein; no response is required), and indicated that the National Scenic Byways Plan has been discontinued (please see EIR §4.10 for discussion of the National Scenic Byway Program). The full text of Caltrans' comment letter is provided in Appendix B; the full text of the RTP is provided on the County website: http://monocounty.ca.gov/planning/page/mono-county-general-plan-update.

This EIR serves as an informational document to inform decision-makers and the public of the potential environmental consequences of approving the proposed plan. The RTP provides policies and actions designed to avoid or minimize significant environmental impacts, as summarized in this EIR. The RTP also presents specific short-range (up to 10

years) and long-range (20+ years) projects for highways, streets and roads, transit, goods movement, aviation, and bicycle and pedestrian trail systems; this EIR evaluates the actions on a regional and programmatic level of detail, but does not specifically analyze individual projects. Project-specific environmental analyses will be conducted as the projects are proposed for implementation, with a scope and focus appropriate to each project.

To facilitate understanding of the impact analysis and recommended policy mitigations, this section (as with other EIR sections) provides an overview of baseline circulation and transportation in Mono County. Detailed discussion of baseline conditions is provided in the Mono County MEA, which has been updated in concert with the current General Plan/RTP EIR. The reader is referred to the Mono County MEA for a full discussion of existing transportation in Mono County. The MEA can be accessed at http://monocounty.ca.gov/planning/page/mono-county-general-plan-update. Key findings of the §4.2 impact analysis and recommended mitigating policies are summarized in the table below:

SUMMARY OF GENERAL PLAN IMPACTS & POLICY MITIGATIONS FOR AIR QUALITY

IMPACT RTP 4.2(a):	**REGULTORY COMPLIANCE**
Pre-Mitigation Significance:	**No Significant Impact**
Mitigating Policies:	**See Table 4.2-10 in Appendix D**
Residual Significance:	**No Significant Impact**
IMPACT RTP 4.2(b):	**CONGESTION MANAGEMENT**
Pre-Mitigation Significance:	**Less than Significant Impact**
Mitigating Policies:	**See Table 4.2-10 in Appendix D**
Residual Significance:	**Less than Significant Impact**
IMPACT RTP 4.2(c):	**AIR TRAFFIC SAFETY**
Pre-Mitigation Significance:	**No Significant Impact**
Mitigating Policies:	**See Table 4.2-10 in Appendix D**
Residual Significance:	**No Significant Impact**
IMPACT RTP 4.2(d):	**EMERGENCY ACCESS**
Pre-Mitigation Significance:	**Less than Significant Impact**
Mitigating Policies:	**See Table 4.2-10 in Appendix D**
Residual Significance:	**Less than Significant Impact**
IMPACT RTP 4.2(e):	**MULTI-MODAL TRANSPORTATION**
Pre-Mitigation Significance:	**No Significant Impact**
Mitigating Policies:	**See Table 4.2-10 in Appendix D**
Residual Significance:	**No Significant Impact**

4.2.2 KEY TERMS USED IN THIS SECTION

Forecast Period. RTP forecasts cover a 20-year time frame, with review every four years as part of the update process.

Level of Service (LOS) is a qualitative measure describing operational conditions as perceived by motorists within a traffic stream. LOS generally describes these conditions in terms such as speed and travel time, freedom to maneuver, traffic interruptions, comfort and convenience, and safety. Current LOS conditions are based on the latest traffic counts. Projected LOS conditions are based on growth factors derived from historical growth trends.

Multi-Modal Transportation. A combination of two or more modes of transportation that may include motorized transportation (air, road, rail and/or sea), as well as non-motorized movement (pedestrian, equestrian, bicycling, etc.).

Paratransit. This term refers to special transportation services provided for people with disabilities. Paratransit often consists of services supplemental to fixed-route public bus and rail systems and may range from small buses with flexible routes to on-demand door-to-door service. Paratransit services may be offered by public agencies, profit and nonprofit organizations and community groups.

Transportation Demand Management (TDM). TDM refers to measures designed to reduce vehicle trips, trip lengths, and congestion. TDM encourages wider use of transit, vanpools, carpools, and other alternatives to the single occupant

automobile. TDM measures provide alternatives to large investments in new highway and transit systems, which are limited by lack of money, adverse community reactions, and other factors. TDM measures are designed to modify travel demand patterns, resulting in lower capital outlays. They may be implemented within a short time frame and evaluated quickly. Several policy issues arise in determining the extent to which TDM may be used to reduce congestion, including the effectiveness of voluntary vs. mandatory measures, and the need to apply them only to new development or to all employers of a specific size.

Airport Safety Concepts.[1] The State Division of Aeronautics notes that airport safety compatibility is determined through evaluation of locations around an airport that are at greatest risk of an aircraft accident; a long record of evidence indicates that accidents most frequently occur along the extended runway centerline. Proper safety and airspace protection minimizes the number of people on and off the airport that are exposed to the risks associated with potential aircraft accidents and avoids flight hazards that interfere with aircraft navigation. Approximately 65% of general aviation takeoff/departure accidents occur during the initial climb phase, which is when aircraft engines are under greatest stress. The remaining 23% of takeoff/departure accidents occur as the aircraft approaches the runway for landing; common causes during this phase include pilot misjudgment of the rate of descent, poor visibility, unexpected downdrafts, or tall objects beneath the final approach. The types of events that lead to approach accidents tend to place the accident site fairly close to the extended runway centerline. The probability of accidents increases as the flight path nears the approach end of the runway.

4.2.3 OVERVIEW OF EXISTING CONDITIONS

4.2.3.1 Existing Transportation System

The Mono County transportation system comprises facilities for private cars, commercial trucking, and a transit system with local and regional connections. Private automobiles are the primary mode for personal transportation, while trucks are the primary mode for moving goods. These transportation modes are essential to sustain social, economic and recreational activities in Mono County, where weather and terrain and small populations serve to limit other transportation modes.

US 395 is the principal route to and through Mono County. US 395 also serves as the main corridor for emergency purposes, provides access to the county's many recreational and tourist attractions, and connections to central California via seasonal trans-Sierra routes including SRs 120, 89 and 108. US 6 and SRs 167 and 182 provide regional links to US 395 from adjacent areas of Nevada. The existing highway system will continue to be the main access for both residents and visitors to and through the county.

The County maintains roughly 684 miles of County roads. Though the County roadway system is largely complete, new facilities are needed in some community areas to increase emergency access and provide for continued growth. Maintenance of existing roadways remains the highest priority for the County roadway system. Transit services in the county currently include interregional and countywide services provided by ESTA (Eastern Sierra Transit Authority). Countywide services are expected to increase in response to demand and availability of funding.

Three public airports are located in Mono County: Mammoth Yosemite Airport, Lee Vining Airport, and Bridgeport Airport (Bryant Field). The Town of Mammoth Lakes owns and operates the Mammoth Yosemite Airport; the County owns and operates the Lee Vining and Bridgeport airports. Planned improvements at the Lee Vining Airport and Bryant Field will increase safety at those airports. Planned improvements at the Mammoth Yosemite Airport will increase safety and expand the facilities to support additional commercial aircraft service.

Facilities for non-motorized activities such as bicycling are limited to numerous trails and roads on public lands and on existing roadways (where the shoulder may or may not be wide enough to accommodate the use). To reduce air emissions and enhance community livability, RTP policies promote the development of additional non-motorized

[1] California Department of Transportation, Division of Aeronautics, *Airport Land Use Planning Handbook,* 2011.

facilities for pedestrians, bicyclists and cross country skiers, primarily in community areas. RTP policies also promote the development of regional trails, such as the currently conceptual Eastern Sierra Regional Trail.

4.2.3.2 Existing and Future Transportation Needs and Issues

The Draft RTP identifies 16 specific needs and issues to be addressed in the RTP. These include:

- Improving and maintaining state and federal highways since they are the major roadways in the county.
- Maintaining and improving County roadways and obtaining additional funding to do so.
- Ensuring that future development pays for its impacts on the local transportation and circulation system.
- The California Transportation Commission (CTC) has suggested that improving the coordination between regional project planning and environmental streamlining would be the most effective way planning resources could be brought to bear for better project delivery. In response, there is the need to work with appropriate agencies such as Caltrans, the USFS, the BLM, the CDFW, the LTC, the County, and the Town of Mammoth Lakes to define environmental objectives, to design transportation projects in a manner that improves both the transportation system and the surrounding community and/or natural environment, and to incorporate environmental mitigation measures and enhancement projects into the planning process for transportation improvements to both state and local circulation systems.
- Enhancing the scenic qualities of highway projects and related highway maintenance facilities, including efforts to expand scenic highway and byway designations in Mono County.
- Increasing transit services at local, regional, and interregional levels in order to improve air quality, reduce congestion, and provide alternative methods of moving people and goods to and through the county.
- Improving and expanding non-motorized facilities within and between community areas. There is the potential to link existing trail systems, which are predominantly on public lands, to newly developed trail systems on private and County lands in community areas, and provide wayfinding elements.
- Providing adequate community parking facilities in community areas for all types of vehicles.
- Encouraging additional carpooling and studying the potential to provide additional park-and-ride facilities.
- Expanding air services and transit options at the Mammoth Yosemite Airport in order to help alleviate surface transportation problems in the town of Mammoth Lakes. Continued improvement of the airport facilities is necessary in order to expand services.
- Correlating development of the transportation and circulation system with future land use development.
- Ensuring that local transportation planning and programs are consistent with state and federal goals, policies, and programs pertaining to transportation systems and facilities.
- Participating in regional transportation planning and projects, such as the Yosemite Area Regional Transportation System (YARTS) and joint planning efforts with Kern, Inyo, and San Bernardino counties, in order to develop an efficient regional system.
- Continuing to increase public participation in the transportation planning process and ensuring that all shareholders in the local transportation system are represented in the planning process.
- Residents of community areas throughout the unincorporated area of the county are concerned about providing safety improvements to the highway and roadway system and establishing and maintaining local trail systems for use by bicyclists, pedestrians, equestrians, and other non-motorized users.
- The main issues in the town of Mammoth Lakes are improving air quality, reducing congestion, and maintaining the resort character of the town by providing additional pedestrian and bicycle facilities and by expanding year-round townwide transit service.
- For those main streets that also function as California State Highways, improve coordination with Caltrans to balance local needs for a vibrant community street with the public's need for roadways that provide local, regional and statewide connections. Just as mobility is essential to California's economic and civic vitality, the planning, design and operation of main streets is tied to the prosperity and quality of life for local communities.

4.2.3.3 Public Participation in RTP Development

The Mono County RTP reflects wide-ranging public input and participation throughout the transportation planning process. Key elements of the outreach effort included ongoing input from each of the County's active RPACs,

community meetings, and workshops to address specific transportation issues (including pedestrian safety on US 395 in Lee Vining, and walkable community elements in numerous communities), US 395 passing lanes in northern Mono County, Main Street planning in Bridgeport, regional corridor planning for US 395, and other transportation issues), input from the Mono County Collaborative Planning Team (encompassing representatives from 14 agencies at the local, tribal, state and federal levels), a Transit Technical Advisory Committee that convened in Mammoth Lakes to develop the Town's Transit System Design and Development Plan, input from Native American communities in Bridgeport and Benton as well as tribal participants in Mono Basin and Antelope Valley, and input from persons with disabilities gained in the Unmet Transit Needs hearing process and consultation with social services providers.

4.2.3.4 RTP Purpose

As stated in the Mono County RTP, the plan is intended to serve the following purposes:

- Provide a clear vision of the regional transportation goals, policies, objectives and strategies – this vision must be realistic and within fiscal constraints;
- Assess current modes of transportation and the potential of new travel options within the region;
- Project/estimate the future needs for travel and goods movement;
- Identify and document specific actions necessary to address the region's mobility, non-motorized circulation needs, accessibility needs, and goals for walkable communities;
- Identify guidance and document public policy decisions by local, regional, state and federal officials regarding transportation expenditures and financing;
  - Identify needed transportation improvements in sufficient detail to serve as a foundation for development of the Federal Transportation Improvement Program (FTIP) and Interregional Transportation Improvement Program (ITIP);
  - Facilitation of the National Environmental Protection Act (NEPA)/404 integration process decisions;
  - Identification of project purposes and need;
- Employ performance measures that demonstrate the effectiveness of the transportation improvement projects in meeting the intended goals of MAP-21 (Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century);
- Promote consistency between the California Transportation Plan, the Mono County RTP and other transportation plans developed by cities, counties, districts, private organizations, tribal governments, and state and federal agencies responding to statewide and interregional transportation issues and needs;
- Provide a forum for: 1) participation and cooperation, and 2) facilitation of partnerships that reconcile transportation issues that transcend regional boundaries; and
- Involve the public, federal, state and local agencies, as well as local elected officials, early in the transportation planning process so as to include them in discussions and decisions on the social, economic, air quality and environmental issues related to transportation.

4.2.3.5 Existing Travel Demands.

Average daily traffic (ADT) volumes on Mono County State Highways are summarized in Table 4.2-1 below, including 2006 and 2012 data for peak hour demands, peak month demands, and annual demands.

TABLE 4.2-1: Average Daily Traffic Volumes on Mono Co. State Highways, 2006 & 2012[2]

Route	Location	Peak Hour[a] 2006/2012	Peak Month[b] 2006/2012	Annual[c] 2006/2012
395	Junction 203 West [d]	1200/1200	11900/11100	9200/8000
	June Lake Junction [e]	660/790	6300/7400	4000/4200
	Tioga Pass Junction [f]	710/630	6700/6400	4000/4500
	Bridgeport [g]	670/630	6000/5700	3800/3400
	Sonora Junction [h]	790/500	4550/4300	3100/2900
	Nevada State Line	510/500	4950/4750	3750/3400

[2] **SOURCE:** Caltrans 2006 and 2012 Traffic Volumes on California State Highways.

6	Junction 395 (Bishop)	360/110	4100/2000	3800/1890
	Benton Station	140/100	1150/1150	1100/960
	Nevada State Line	100/100	1150/1120	960/870
168	Oasis, Junction 266 north	40/40	270/290	160/170
266	Oasis, Junction 168	50/20	250/250	200/140
203	Minaret Summit	130/130	780/780	620/620
	Minaret Junction	1450/1400	13000/12400	11200/8750
	Old Mammoth Junction	1750/1600	17500/16400	15300/12500
158	June Lake Junction 395	290/280	2600/2850	1700/1470
	Grant Lake Junction 395	100/110	800/870	400/400
120	Yosemite East Gate	250/330	3200/3310	2100/2560
	Tioga Pass Junction 395	350/430	3300/4350	1300/1330
	Mono Mills Junction 395	100/130	830/1150	380/490
	Benton Station	60/60	550/500	400/300
167	Pole Line Junction 395	40/40	300/300	200/200
	Nevada State Line	20/20	200/170	100/110
270	To Bodie State Hist. Park	100/120	600/620	425/470
182	Bridgeport Junction 395	180/180	1700/1700	1100/1100
	Nevada State Line	50/50	380/400	250/250
108	Sonora Pass	150/180	980/570	480/470
	Sonora Junction 395	120/120	950/1050	550/670
89	To Monitor Pass (SR 89)	100/100	730/580	300/440

a. Figures are estimated.
b. The peak month ADT is the average daily traffic for the month of heaviest traffic flow.
c. Annual ADT is total annual traffic volume divided by 365 days. For routes that are regularly closed in winter for one month or more, ADT reflects travel when the route is open. Seasonal routes include portions of Routes 89, 108, 120, 158, 203 and 270.
d. Reflects traffic turning into Mammoth. Counts on US 395 going north from 203 are lower.
e. Reflects traffic turning into June Lake. Counts on US 395 going north from 158 are lower.
f. Reflects traffic from SR 120 north on US 395 toward Lee Vining.
g. Reflects traffic going north out of Bridgeport.
h. Reflects traffic going north from the Sonora Junction.

The RTP notes that performance conditions on local streets are generally not a concern since local streets typically carry only local traffic; state and federal highways serve as the main access to each community in the county and carry the greatest amount of traffic.

4.2.3.6 Regional Highway Use and Capacity Issues.

Performance conditions on state and federal highways are set by Caltrans systems planning. In District 9, Caltrans has placed the highest emphasis on maintaining and improving the interregional transportation network. Thus a higher priority is given to major improvements on principal arterial routes than to minor arterials or major collectors. Table 4.2-2 shows Caltrans' planned LOS (see Key Terms, §4.2.2) for state and federal highways in Mono County. As shown, most County highways have been assigned LOS D (minimal delays but potentially restricted speeds/maneuverability).

TABLE 4.2-2: Summary of Caltrans Systems Planning Route Concepts for Routes in Mono County			
ROUTE	FUNCTIONAL CLASSIFICATION	CONCEPT LEVEL OF SERVICE	CONCEPT FACILITY[3]
6	Minor arterial	B	2-lane conventional
89	Minor arterial	D	2-lane conventional
108	Minor arterial	D	2-lane conventional
120	Minor arterial	D	2-lane conventional
158	Major collector	D	2-lane conventional
167	Minor arterial	D	2-lane conventional
168	Minor arterial	D	2-lane conventional
182	Major collector	D	2-lane conventional
203	Minor arterial	E	2-lane conventional/ 4-lane conventional
266	Major collector	D	2-lane conventional
270	Major collector	E	2-lane conventional
395	Principal arterial	B, C, E	4-lane expressway/conventional/ 2-lane conventional

Caltrans is working to increase capacity on US 395, the route on which performance conditions are most affected by traffic levels. The RTP anticipates that performance conditions on other highways will remain as shown above with periodic reevaluation as new performance measures are established and LOS alternatives are identified. Outlined below are the primary needs and issues associated with Mono County state highways.

US 395. As noted above, US 395 is and will remain the major access to and through Mono County and the major transportation route in the area. Primary needs for US 395 throughout Mono County are listed below:

- Maintain four lanes from the Inyo/Mono county line to Lee Vining;
- Allow for passing lane improvements to the conventional two-lane highway north of Lee Vining;
- Provide safe winter access countywide;
- Increase passing opportunities north of Lee Vining;
- During maintenance projects, add shoulders adequate for pedestrian safety, motorist safety, and bike use, including potential separated grade wildlife crossings;
- Improve system safety and maintenance;
- Develop sufficient revenue sources to meet these needs.

US 6. US 6 extends from the Inyo County line north of Bishop to the Nevada state line, providing regional and interregional transportation connections and is a trucking route between Southern California, Reno, and the western mountain states (Washington, Idaho, Montana). Caltrans has identified the primary purpose of the route as interregional traffic (largely trucks). US 6 is currently a maintenance-only route with some improvements planned for the future as traffic volumes increase. The major local concerns about US 6 are safety during the periodic dust storms, and speeds through community areas. Dust issues center on reduced visibility from plowed fields and flash flood deposits that blow across the highway. Some local landowners are working with the Great Basin Unified Air Pollution Control District to develop plans to mitigate dust from agricultural fields; although little can be done about dust resulting from flood deposits, consideration may be given to an ITS dust sensor warning system to alert drivers of dust storm locations. Vehicles traveling at high speed through community areas are also a concern, both for local traffic trying to access the highway and for pedestrian safety. Vehicle speed feedback signs have recently been installed, and there is currently interest in pursuing a Safe Route to School access across US 6 in Benton and Chalfant, and reducing speeds through Chalfant.

[3] A "conventional" facility has no access control, whereas an "expressway" has limited access control .

SRs 120, 167, 182, 108, and 89. The remaining state highways in Mono County provide interregional access from US 395 to Nevada and to the western side of the Sierra. SRs 120, 108, and 89, which cross the Sierra in high mountain passes, are closed in winter. Concerns on these routes include continued adequate maintenance, timely road openings following winter closures and intermittent winter access during low-snow years.

Mountain Passes. There is interest in attempting to keep the mountain passes (Tioga, Sonora, and Monitor) open as long as possible in order to increase access from the west and provide an economic boost to local communities. The County coordinates with Caltrans and Yosemite National Park to keep Tioga Pass open as long as possible, as do west-side communities near Sonora and Monitor passes.

Regional Capacity Issues. The regional highway system experiences capacity problems on SR 203 in the town of Mammoth Lakes and on SR 158 in June Lake Village. An overriding goal of Caltrans is to provide four lanes on US 395 north through Lee Vining to achieve an LOS "B." On US 395 north of Lee Vining, passing lanes, truck-climbing lanes, and operational improvements will be necessary at specific locations to maintain a "C" LOS (environmental and geometric constraints prohibit a higher LOS). The significance of these improvements is reflected in the decision by Mono County LTC to identify the North County passing lanes as a Mono County MOU project.

Local Capacity Issues. Although capacity constraints are most evident in the town of Mammoth Lakes during peak visitation periods, congestion on SR 158 in June Lake Village has also been a major concern in the past, and the June Lake Area Plan contains policies and programs to address that issue.

Emergency Response Issues. The Mono County Emergency Operations Plan (EOP) outlines how emergency workers should respond to major emergencies within the county. The plan links local detailed standard operating procedures (SOPs) at the local level to broader state and federal disaster planning. The EOP addresses potential transportation-related hazards that include earthquakes, volcanic eruptions, floods, and hazardous materials transport. The EOP also addresses emergency preparedness and emergency response for the regional transportation system, including the identification of emergency routes.

Terrain and land ownership patterns generally limit alternative access routes in Mono County to the existing street and highway system. However, Mono County has developed alternative access routes for some community areas with limited access, including North Shore Drive in June Lake, and the Mammoth Scenic Loop north of Mammoth Lakes. The County also consults with Cal Fire for emergency access requirements for new development in the State Responsibility Areas that cover most of the private property in Mono County. Ongoing GIS mapping will further enhance and support alternative route awareness for emergency response and incident location.

Transportation for Disabled Persons. The Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) requires public and private transportation projects to comply with the ADA. This requires that transportation facilities are accessible to disabled persons; e.g., pedestrian facilities, parking areas, turnouts, kiosks, etc. must be wheelchair accessible. All transit services must also comply with the requirements of the ADA. The ADA requires the availability of wheelchair lift-equipped fixed-route buses and door-to-door service for disabled persons who cannot use the fixed-route service. ESTA buses are equipped with wheelchair lifts and also provide door-to-door demand-responsive service.

Aviation Safety. Airplanes crashes have occurred in the High Sierra, and the likelihood of future aircraft accidents in the more-inaccessible areas of the high country will increase with air travel demands. The FAA recently installed an instrumentation system at the Mammoth Yosemite Airport intended to reduce accidents in that area. Planned improvements at all County airports (e.g., lighting, fencing, taxiways, runway overruns) will also increase safety.

Highway Safety. The California Highway Patrol (CHP) tracks collisions in Mono County (see www.chp.ca.gov, SWITRS (Statewide Integrated Traffic Records System), Table 8). Between 2001 and 2010, Mono County had an average of five fatal collisions per year with an average of five persons killed per year. During the same period, in Mono County, there was an average of 116 injury collisions per year with an average of 171 persons injured. Most collisions and injuries occur from November through February and June through July, the periods of heaviest tourist visitation. Wildlife collisions are a concern throughout the county (note that the *Draft RTP* provides figures that indicate collision points on US 395, and animal mortality by density). There is a perception of high collision rates in North County, and clear evidence of

high collision rates in South County between SR 203 and Crowley Lake Drive. There is interest in projects to reduce these collisions and animal mortality rates.

Wildlife Collisions. Use of the transportation system impacts local wildlife. Limited visibility, road speeds, migration paths and driver error result in road kills of deer, rodents, mammals and birds. Caltrans has sought to minimize collisions by increasing highway visibility, limiting vegetation on shoulders and providing signage that warns drivers of deer migration paths and nearby habitats. Caltrans continues to assess the potential benefits of additional signing and other measures. Deer crossings under highways have proved effective in some areas but are costly, requiring several miles of tall fencing on each side of the crossing to be effective. They have been considered in the area north of the Sonora Junction on US 395 and are currently under consideration along US 395 south of Mammoth Lakes.

Cell Phone Service. Cell phone service is poor in parts of the county due to isolation and extreme weather conditions. To ensure adequate cell service throughout the county, additional cell towers have been installed in areas lacking service or with poor service; additional towers may be necessary. Specific policies for broadband and related communication infrastructure have been developed in a companion Communications Element.

Avalanche Hazards. The potential for avalanches is a concern in numerous community areas including Twin Lakes, Virginia Lakes, Lundy Lake, June Lake, Long Valley, along US 395 in areas just north of Lee Vining, east of McGee Mountain, at Wilson Butte between Mammoth Lakes and June Lake, and along SR 158 (the June Lake Loop). North Shore Drive provides an alternative route into June Lake that mitigates impacts of potential avalanches along SR 158. Additionally, LTC is in the process of examining seasonal road closure, including an assessment of traveler safety associated with potential recreational access during low-snow years.

Truck Traffic Volumes. Increased levels of truck traffic on highways are a safety concern. US 395 and US 6 are designated interstate truck routes and both experience heavy truck traffic. Whereas medium and heavy-duty trucks comprised 25% of all traffic in the corridor during 2006, five-axle single unit trucks now comprise approximately 80% of all truck traffic. The majority of southbound trucks use US 395 (61%) instead of US 6 (31%). The majority of northbound trucks use US 395 (59%) instead of US 6 (33%). Truck volumes are generally higher in the southbound direction and the average peak period for truck traffic is the midday period. Concerns focus on the impact of oversized trucks on the safety of two-lane highway sections and the lack of paved shoulders and adequate sight distances. As an example, the LTC is supportive of Caltrans' recent efforts to restrict large trucks from passage over SR 108 due to road constraints. Narrow shoulders create hazardous conditions for bicyclists and vehicles (particularly when vehicles pull over for emergencies). US 395 improvement to four lanes has mitigated safety issues in parts of the county, but concerns about truck traffic remain significant on US 6 (a two-lane road with no shoulders) in the Tri-Valley area.

Recreational Traffic. Mono County experiences a great deal of recreational travel, both to and through the county. Most of that traffic occurs on US 395; in summer, additional traffic occurs on SRs 120, 108, and 89, which provide access from the west side of the Sierra. Recreational traffic creates specific problems for the local transportation and circulation system, due both to the amount and type of that traffic. Winter ski weekends, particularly during peak holiday periods, result in congested traffic patterns not unlike rush hour traffic patterns found in more-urban areas. Recreational events during the summer may also create congested traffic patterns, particularly in community areas. Further, recreational travelers have special needs (turnouts/vista points, rest areas, interpretive and site information, lodging, routes, etc.). Safety issues are another concern since recreational travelers (particularly RVs) often travel slowly, disrupt traffic flow, and may stop along the road to enjoy views or take photos. In community areas, RVs often have difficulty parking or use more than their share of limited parking spaces. Table 4.2-3 presents US 395 origin and destination data for 1989, 2000 and 2011. As shown, recreational travel has declined from levels of 1989, while commuting, intra-state travel, destination travel, and goods movement have increased.

TABLE 4.2-3: US 395 Origination and Destination Changes Over Time

Use	1989 Report Results	2000 Report Results	2011 Report Results
Purpose = Recreational	80%	55%	61%
Purpose = Work	2%	13%	22%
From Other States	9%	28%	24%

From Other Countries	2%	1%	5%
Mono Co. Final Destination	24%	41%	42%
Stop Small Communities "Often"	NA	31%	28%
Stop Small Communities "Sometimes"	NA	48%	36%
Goods Movement	2%	12%	9%
Source: RTP.			

Many of the needs of recreational travelers have been addressed by recently completed or ongoing projects. The four-laning of US 395 to Lee Vining eliminated many of the problems associated with slow-moving vehicles. Transportation enhancement projects related to the Eastern Sierra Scenic Byway have provided turnouts and information for travelers. Area plan policies, such as those of June Lake, Mono Basin, and Bodie Hills, address parking in community areas and transportation linkages between communities and recreational areas.

Hazardous Materials Spills. Hazardous materials spills are a concern, particularly on US 395 and US 6 where truck traffic volumes are highest. Trucks haul a variety of commodities through Mono County, including petroleum and coal products, and chemicals (roughly 7% of truck traffic carries these products). The Mono County Integrated Waste Management Plan contains policies to address hazardous waste spills, as does the EOP.

Public Health. Hospitals in Mono County have limited capacity for multi-casualty incidents. Many accident victims with critical injuries are transported to facilities outside the county. Another concern is that access to various parts of the county may be limited during certain times of the year or during certain hazardous conditions.

4.2.3.7 Circulation Issues in Mono County Communities.

In addition to the regional highway use and capacity issues described above, the Community and RPACs have identified issues that are important in their communities as summarized in Table 4.2-4:

TABLE 4.2-4: Circulation and Parking Issues in Mono County Communities	
COMMUNITY	**TRANSPORTATION ISSUES**
Antelope Valley[4]	Safety improvements on US 395 (including turn lanes at heavily used areas on US 395, such as the high school in Coleville, and possibly at the intersections with Larson Lane, Cunningham Lane, and Topaz Lane), and safety improvements to Eastside Lane (focused on the first turn on Eastside north of its intersection with US 395).
	Residents consider the existing road system to be adequate, but believe that existing private roads serving as public roads should be brought up to standard.
	Residents question the need to four-lane US 395 in Antelope Valley (especially since adjacent Nevada has no plans for four lanes), and would prefer that the route remain two lanes with operational improvements such as wider shoulder, deer fences & underpasses, and landscaping. Residents are also interested in retaining the scenic qualities of US 395 between communities.
	There is substantial interest in a loop bike route through the valley. Some interest has been expressed for providing pedestrian and equestrian facilities along a similar loop route, as well as mountain biking opportunities.
	Residents would like greater enforcement of vehicles passing in unsafe areas throughout the valley.
	There is a need for call boxes where cell service is lacking or unlikely due to topography.
Swauger Creek/ Devil's Gate	Residents support fence design to facilitate wildlife movements, particularly deer migration routes, Bi-State sage-grouse impacts, and protection from highway traffic.
	Establishing a speed limit of 25 mph on all secondary roads.

[4] Residents of the Antelope Valley consider their existing community road system, much of which is unimproved private roads, to be adequate. However, existing private roads that are functioning as public roads should be brought up to standard.

	Limiting new secondary roads to those required for access to private residences; minimizing the visual impact of roads, using construction practices that minimize dust and erosion (drainage, culverts, road bases and finishes); and prohibiting construction on designated wet meadow areas.
Bridgeport Valley[5]	Working with the County and consultants, residents recently completed a Main Street Revitalization Plan for US 395 through Bridgeport; the plan addresses many of the concerns noted below.
	Residents are concerned about pedestrian and bicyclist safety along US 395 and SR 182 from the Evans Tract to the Bridgeport Reservoir dam. Residents recommend as priority items a bike lane on SR 182, and widening the shoulder along US 395 from the Evans Tract to SR 182.
	Other safety concerns include enforcement of the speed limit through town, the design of several intersections, and the number of deer kills on Twin Lakes Road from Hunewill Hills to Twin Lakes.
	Parking is a problem on Main Street and around County buildings, especially when court is in session and during peak tourist seasons. There is some interest in providing additional off-street parking, possibly next to the Probation Department or on empty lots on Emigrant Street.
	There is interest in developing a bike lane connecting Bridgeport and Twin Lakes, either by widening the shoulder or creating a separate bike path that parallels the existing roadway
	There is interest in eventually developing local bike trails and/or loops, and hiking/pedestrian trails, in Bridgeport and the surrounding recreational areas.
	There is a need for call boxes where cell service is lacking or unlikely due to topography.
Bodie Hills	Issues include improved transportation facilities and upgraded parking, particularly for buses at Bodie State Historic Park. Also recommended is the use of unique and historically compatible modes of travel to Bodie (rail, equestrian, horse-drawn wagons, and trails).
	Transportation improvements into and around the park are needed, including: a) paving Bodie Road up to the cattle guard, having it accepted into the State Highway system, and designating SR 270 as a scenic highway with turnouts & interpretive displays; b) paving Cottonwood Canyon Road to Bodie to reduce dust; and c) if park visitation expands beyond carrying capacity (and to accommodate winter visitors), provide an off-site interagency visitor center and office complex. There is some interest in constructing a satellite parking facility and shuttle bus service outside the Bodie Bowl.
Mono Basin	Residents seek to maintain the small-town quality of life.
	Residents support increased tourism focused on developing Lee Vining as a destination rather than a quick-stop highway town.
	Residents seek improved visitor services.
	Maintain and increase the attractiveness of the community.
	Enhance the visual appearance of Lee Vining along US 395 with landscaping, improved or raised pedestrian crossings, street furniture, revised parking configurations, and provisions for the convenient loading and unloading of tour buses.
	Caltrans and Mono County road maintenance facilities detract from the appearance of the Lee Vining commercial district. Relocation of facilities would allow redevelopment that enhances main street appearance, and could be coordinated with road maintenance facility needs of other entities. If relocation is infeasible, their appearance should be enhanced (landscaping, fencing, painting, etc.) with connectivity to nearby public facilities.
	Reengineering the five-lane section of US 395 through Lee Vining would allow the balancing of competing needs (including convenient parking for business patrons; slower traffic, bike lanes, and pedestrian facilities for residents; traffic flow in front of businesses; and convenient interregional travel for motorists traveling through Mono County.
	The community is interested in developing visual interest and gateway design elements at the north and south entrances to Lee Vining.
	The community seeks to balance community goals (pedestrian safety & comfort, roadway aesthetics, community economics) with the need to move traffic safely and efficiently along US 395.
	There is a desire for pedestrian improvements throughout Lee Vining and environs including safe pedestrian crossings across US 395, tools to slow southbound traffic entering Lee Vining, additional

[5] Note: Bridgeport residents, working with consultants and Mono County, recently completed a Main Street Revitalization Plan for U.S. 395 through Bridgeport that addresses many of the concerns outlined in this table.

	pedestrian trails to activity nodes, and bikeway improvements throughout.
	Improved parking facilities for visitors, trucks and buses in the summer months.
	Explore options to extend the dates when SR 120 (through Yosemite & east to Benton) is open.
	Provide safe access around avalanche hazards on US 395 north of Lee Vining, possibly with a bypass.
	Expand and enhance local transit services to better link Mono Basin to other communities and attractions, including storage for bicycles and backpacks.
	Offer low-cost backpacker shuttles to reduce multi-day trailhead parking.
	Consider improvements to offer commercial service at Lee Vining Airport, the airport closest to Yosemite National Park.
June Lake	Explore ways to reduce peak-season congestion and winter closures on SR 158 (June Lake Loop's major road), particularly in light of traffic increases forecast to occur in tandem with improvements to the June Mountain Ski Area and environs.
	Traffic congestion is expected to increase due to June Mountain Ski Area improvements and development; increased traffic will aggravate congestion and conflicts between vehicles and pedestrians as well as the frequency of accidents.
	Steep slopes, sensitive environmental habitats, and limited right of way hinder widening of SR 158.
	Small lot configurations, building encroachments into setbacks, and fragmented ownership impede roadway improvements. The inability to provide adequate access to some private lands will limit the development potential of those lands.
	June Lake Village lacks a cohesive and integrated system for traffic, parking, and pedestrian circulation, with an accident rate above statewide average for similar highways.
	Limited parking in commercial & recreational areas, which aggravates traffic flow, creates safety hazards & may impact tourism revenues. On-street parking interferes with snow removal & circulation during winter. Adequate snow removal and management would prevent some parking problems.
	Snow removal on SR 158 causes traffic delays, limits patron access to businesses, and sometimes requires pedestrians to mix with vehicles on plowed roads. Snow storage sites are lacking.
	Limited circulation may hamper local emergency services and evacuations.
	Many Loop roads lack proper grading, shoulders, setback and design features; these shortcomings increase costs for maintenance, repair and snow removal, limit emergency vehicle access and contribute to erosion and impaired traffic circulation.
	Pedestrian features are limited to SR 158 sidewalks through the Village; the sidewalks have varying widths, non-uniform construction materials, and obstructions (stairs, driveways, etc.)
	Some June Lake Village multi-modal improvements may qualify for MAP-21 or ATP funding.
	Many roadway easements are incompatible with topography and development constraints. Easements potentially eligible for vacation should be identified.
	In situations where the County vacates rights of way along street easements, the community may benefit as the properties revert to adjacent owners and becomes eligible for new development; alternatively, some vacations may hinder fire and emergency services by limiting public access or reducing the ability of service providers to locate facilities.
	Vacation of road rights of way could hinder future fire protection, emergency services, and activities of June Lake PUD or SCE (both of which use existing easements for access and facilities).
	June Lake Loop lacks distinctive street signs that reflect the mountain character of the community. Signs newly installed as part of the 911 emergency response program feature design elements that are compatible with this alpine environment.
	There is an opportunity to increase public transit access to and throughout the June Lake community.
	Improved and expanded pedestrian trails would improve safety, increase pedestrian traffic, and expand the range of recreational opportunities along the Loop. Currently, most of June Lake's trails are on public lands outside the community; trails on private lands would link major commercial centers with residential development, lodging facilities and recreational nodes.
	Cross-country ski trails could link future development and provide an alternative to automobile travel. However, cross country trails in the Loop are severely limited by avalanche and other factors.
Mammoth Vicinity/ Upper Owens	Residents seek to maintain the US 395 scenic corridor and provide bike routes in the western portion of Long Valley on existing roadways.
Long Valley	Residents want to maintain the rural recreational character while developing an effective and safe

	circulation system including adequate emergency access, upgrading local roads to county standards, discouraging traffic in residential areas, and encouraging alternative transportation.
	Residents are interested in bike lanes around Crowley Lake, from Long Valley to Convict Lake Road; from Long Valley to Mammoth Lakes; and along South Landing Road.
	Local safety would be improved with provision of routes for pedestrians and bicyclists in the Crowley Lake/Hilton Creek area, along Crowley Lake Drive and South Landing Road. Interest has also been expressed in developing trails along parts of the Whiskey Creek riparian corridor.
	Residents are concerned about safety at the intersection of Lower Rock Creek Rd and US 395, and interested in eliminating that intersection and realigning Lower Rock Ck Rd to terminate at Tom's Place and/or developing a separate Class I bicycle path from Tom's Place to Lower Rock Creek Road.
Wheeler Crest/ Paradise	Residents seek improved transportation to better protect and access unique scenic, recreational and environmental resources of the area. The lack of alternative transportation in the community and linking the area to other communities is a major concern. Residents are interested in providing a bicycle climbing lane on Lower Rock Creek Road from Tom's Place to the Inyo County line.
Tri-Valley	Residents seek improved safety and access to the rest of the county including safe & adequate access to US 6; safety along US 6 during hazardous conditions (primarily dust storms); provision of rest stops along US 6; inclusion of US 6 in the countywide scenic highway system for its historic significance; and provision of a bike path connecting Bishop and Chalfant. Residents see need for an emergency services facility & emergency landing strip in Hammil Valley.
	Traffic speed through community areas, and safe routes to school (especially near highway crossings) are additional concerns.
Oasis	Oasis, in the extreme southeastern corner of the county, is separated from the rest of the county by the White Mountains. Oasis is an agricultural area and has identified no transportation needs aside from regular maintenance of the existing highway system
Countywide Parking Issues	Commercial businesses in Bridgeport, Lee Vining, June Lake and elsewhere have been unable to fully comply with parking regulations. The County has adopted alternative compliance measures to mitigate parking & traffic impacts, particularly for new & expanding commercial developments. The new regulations allow use of pedestrian, transit and bike accommodations in lieu of some parking spaces. Parking for buses & large trucks is a continuing problem in some areas; the County anticipates that future recreational & commercial development will increase demand for parking facilities.
	On-street parking creates safety concerns in some areas. In winter, on-street parking may hinder snow removal & on-street parking of large trucks can create a nuisance. Improvements proposed on Bridgeport Main St (reconfiguration/reduction of travel lanes and parking spaces) would encourage slower traffic speeds and converted former travel lanes into a combination of parallel & back-in angle parking. Parking restrictions continue to apply during certain winter hours to allow for snow removal.
	Some communities would like to see the creation of community parking areas instead of requiring all businesses to develop small individual parking areas. There has also been some interest, in Lee Vining, to consider developing or designating a site for large-truck parking.

4.2.3.8 Aviation Trends

Aircraft activity in Mono County is primarily general aviation activity; i.e., aircraft used for firefighting, emergency services, charter service, business or recreational use. The number of aircraft has increased at Bryant Field as well as Lee Vining Airport since 2000 (both facilities had four single-engine aircraft as of 2015), but the total remains very low. Annual aircraft operations have also increased, but use levels at both airports remain low (approximately 11 flights daily on average at Bryant Field, and seven daily flights at Lee Vining). Aviation services and existing airport infrastructure are vital for the movement of people and light cargo, firefighting, and emergency medical purposes. For visitors, the air services provide the only automobile alternate into Mono County, and residents rely on air services for a range of business, governmental, medical and emergency purposes. Mammoth Yosemite Airport (operated by the Town of Mammoth Lakes) is the only airport in Mono County that provides air cargo and FAA-certified commercial service.

4.2.3.9 RTP Recommendations

The 2015 Mono County RTP Action Element offers a wide range of specific recommendations for achieving coordinated multi-modal circulation throughout Mono County. RTP recommendations are summarized below.

TABLE 4.2-5: Summary of Mono County RTP Recommendations

RTP GOAL	RTP RECOMMENDATION
Long-term maintenance of existing roads	Direct county Road Department funds to the operation and maintenance of existing roadways. Roadway construction or rehabilitation projects are limited to those eligible and included in the STIP. Both the RTIP and the STIP now include a preventative maintenance program.
Short-term maintenance of existing roads	Short-range, direct Town Road funds to operation & maintenance of existing roadways. Road construction or rehabilitation projects are limited to those eligible and included in the STIP.
Expand the range of STIP projects to include multi-modal elements	The adopted Mono County STIP serves as the short-range highway improvement program. In the past, STIP funds have been confined to highway projects. Since passage of SB 45, STIP funds are available for a variety of transportation improvements. As a result, although STIP contains primarily highway projects, it also contains projects on County and Town roads, as well as pedestrian and bikeway improvements, and transit projects. These are specific action items to be completed in the immediate future. General action plans, both short-term and long-term, for County and Town roads, aviation, pedestrian facilities, and bikeway facilities are outlined in this RTP.
Interregional Improvement Program Implementation	Caltrans' Interregional Improvement Program (IIP) serves as the long-range highway improvement program for this RTP.
Long-term airport planning	Mono County operates Lee Vining & Bridgeport (Bryant Field) airports, and recently updated its airport layout plans. Transient activity is expected to increase at Lee Vining Airport due to new emphasis on its proximity to Yosemite National Park.
Short-term airport planning	Short-range action plans for Lee Vining Airport and Bryant Field are provided by the Capital Improvement Plan for each airport and include a number of safety improvements.
Mammoth Yosemite Airport planning	The Town of Mammoth Lakes plans extensive improvements to the Mammoth Yosemite Airport to support Bombardier QD400 commercial aircraft service. Short-range action plans for Mammoth Yosemite Airport are provided by the Airport Capital Improvement Plan.
Transit Improvements	The action plans for transit focus on implementing policies in the Eastern Sierra Transit Authority's (ESTA's) Short Range Transit Plan, and the Town of Mammoth Lakes Transit Plan. These plans summarize and analyze existing transit services, evaluate the needs of county residents and visitors for transit services, estimate future demand for transit services, evaluate funding opportunities to sustain long-term viability of the transit system, and delineate policies for the future development and operation of transit systems countywide. ESTA has expanded its routes in response to needs identified in the SRTP and at annual unmet needs hearings.
Interregional Connections	Recommended actions that focus on interregional connections include continuing participation in ESTA and YARTS, in the intercity transit planning process with Inyo and Kern counties and Caltrans District 9, and in the Eastern California Transportation Planning Partnership, which is a collaborative regional transportation planning process with Kern, Inyo, and San Bernardino counties.
Non-Motorized Circulation	The County's action programs for bicyclists, pedestrians, equestrians, cross country skiers and other non-motorized modes of transportation focus on implementing an updated Mono County Trails Plan and on adopting a Bicycle Transportation Plan. RTP policies call for provision of wider shoulders for bike and other uses as a component of street/ highway rehabilitation projects, and focus on walkable communities and increasing multi-modal mobility in the Livable Communities and Active Transportation policy elements.
Funding opportunities	Ensure active and continuous involvement in the STIP process to maximize funding opportunities for rehabilitation and construction projects throughout the county.
Maintenance of non-paved roads	Pursue maintenance activities on unpaved County roads to facilitate public access and emergency service access in remote areas. Maintenance activities now focus on implementing environmentally sensitive operations in order to mitigate impacts to wildlife, such as sage grouse.

The RTP also identifies specific performance measures for desired outcomes including cost effectiveness, customer satisfaction, environmental quality, mobility on the aviation system, mobility on transit systems, mobility on non-motorized facilities, maintenance of existing infrastructure, livability of local communities, sustainability of the local transportation system, reduced wildlife kills, and seasonal closure/extreme weather driving conditions.

4.2.3.10 Bicycle Transportation Plan (BTP)

The *Mono County BTP* describes existing bicycle facilities and programs, analyzes the need for future facilities, designates and prioritizes new routes, provides maps, identifies funding sources, and establishes policies and standards for improving bicycle facilities in the unincorporated area of Mono County. The BTP complies with California Streets and Highways Code §891.2 and §891.4 as well as requirements for state Bicycle Transportation Account (BTA) funding applications. The BTP expands upon the General Bikeway Plan contained in the Mono County Trails Plan (1994) and has been designed to complement similar plans in surrounding counties and communities, including the BTP prepared by the Town of Mammoth Lakes, thus working toward an extensive and complete system. Policies in the document recommend that the *Mono County BTP* be reviewed and updated every five years, in compliance with state requirements for Bicycle Transportation Account (BTA) funding and to ensure that the plan remains current.

Mono County lacks facilities specifically for bicyclists at present; most bicycling occurs on roads where shoulder widths may not be wide enough to safely accommodate motorists and bicyclist, and mountain bike use occurs on dirt roads that are generally unmarked for that purpose. The limited areas with signing for bicycle use include routes along Crowley Lake Drive and South Landing Road (from Tom's Place to Crowley Lake), along Pearson Road in Crowley Lake, North Shore Drive in June Lake, 'Share the Road' signs along Benton Crossing Road and along SR 158 in June Lake, a bicycle/pedestrian bridge over the East Walker River in Bridgeport, a recently designated bike lane on Main Street in Bridgeport, and the Eastside Lane Bike Route in the Antelope Valley. Existing bike racks are located at the June Lake Library and Community Center, the USFS Mono Basin Visitor Center in Lee Vining, behind the Mono Mart in Lee Vining (for employees), the county Annex building in Bridgeport, Lee Vining High School and Lee Vining Community Center.

BTP development included extensive outreach to obtain recommendations and ideas from local bicycling groups including Eastside Velo and the Sierra Cycling Foundation. Table 4.2-6 summarizes overall bicycling needs as identified through the outreach program, as well as needs identified for individual community areas in the county.

TABLE 4.2-6: Existing Needs of the Mono County Bicycle System

Issue	*Identified Needs*
COUNTYWIDE BICYCLE ISSUES	
UPHILL BIKE LANES	Widening uphill shoulders is the single most important step to achieve consistent auto flow travel, bicycle safety and construction economics (build lanes uphill only). Widening uphill sections on the Scenic Loop, Crowley Lake Drive, Benton Crossing Road, upper and lower Rock Creek Road, Convict Lake Road, and SR 120 would be a sensible, economical start.
MAINTENANCE	Existing roads and shoulders should be maintained. Expansion cracks need to be filled and smoothed with special attention to downhill lanes. Benton Crossing Road and the Scenic Loop are examples of downhill stretches of roads in need of crack filling.
CLEANLINESS	Road shoulders should be swept, with uphill sections swept most frequently. Uphill roads with banks and curbs need vacuum-type sweeping rather than pull-broom as the banks trap debris. Major holidays yield more glass and debris.
SIGNAGE	Signs that indicate bicycle traffic give a heads-up to both bicyclists and motorists. "Share the Road" signs on two-lane roads are an inexpensive yet effective way to create safety for all. "Share the Road" signs would be well suited for the Scenic Loop, Crowley Lake Drive, Twin Lakes Road and Benton Crossing Road. Bike Route signs on SR 203, and on US 395 from Tom's Place to June Lake and eventually to Lee Vining would be ideal.
RUMBLE STRIPS	The size and placement of rumble strips, and resulting safety issues, are a concern. The Sierra Cycling Foundation (SCF) explains that the current placement of rumble strips

	forces bicyclists onto a dirty shoulder, and advocates for use of a rumble strip half its current width and placed immediately to the right of the fog line (please see http://www.sierracyclingfoundation.org/positions.htm). SCF also advocates for regular maintenance and sweeping of the shoulder.
BICYCLE-FRIENDLY FEATURES	In addition to signage, street features should be planned to accommodate bicyclists. For example, the wider plates on cattle guards on Benton Crossing Road enable bicyclists to cross safely.
INDIVIDUAL COMMUNITY BICYCLE NEEDS	
ANTELOPE VALLEY	Antelope Valley has several small communities spread out along the perimeter of the valley. Bicyclists currently use local highways and roadways to move between those communities and through the valley. These roadways are adequate to serve current and future bicyclist demand but safety could be improved by widening the shoulders of the roadways and by striping/signage.
	Antelope Valley is separated from the rest of the county by topography. It does not have nearby recreational destinations popular with bicyclists. Opportunities may exist to promote bicycling through the Walker Canyon via the Scenic Byway planning effort.
	The Death Ride is held each year that includes a stretch traveling over Monitor Pass to US 395 and back. There may be an opportunity to coordinate efforts with Alpine County to build upon the success of an event that had 3,500 riders in 2012.
SWAUGER CK/ DEVIL'S GATE	Swauger Creek/Devil's Gate is an isolated residential area where the provision of bikeways has not been an issue.
BRIDGEPORT VALLEY	Bridgeport needs safe commuter routes for children and others from the Evans Tract and the residential areas on SR 182 to the Main Street area and the school. These could be provided by widening the shoulders and designating a bike route or by designating an alternative route.
	Residents have expressed interest in developing a bike route between Bridgeport and Twin Lakes, a popular bicycling route, either by widening the shoulders on Twin Lakes Road or creating a separate bike path that parallels Twin Lakes Road. Both alternatives (especially the latter) may encounter wetlands that would make development difficult. A separate bike path would require obtaining easements or rights of way, which could be expensive and make the project infeasible.
	Residents are also interested in eventually developing a loop trail connecting the Twin Lakes bike trail to Buckeye Canyon Road and linking that segment to a trail around the reservoir.
	The Bridgeport Main Street planning effort developed and implemented Class II bike lanes through the town-site, establishing an opportunity for additional bicycle connectivity to SR 182 and Twin Lakes Road.
MONO BASIN	Mono Basin has a number of dirt roads within the boundaries of the Mono Basin National Forest Scenic Area. Use of those roads is governed by the Comprehensive Management Plan for the Scenic Area, which allows bicycling on existing roads.
	US 395 along the west side of Mono Lake does not have adequate shoulders in some areas for safety. Past efforts to expand shoulders were opposed by some, and the project has since been abandoned by the LTC and Caltrans.
	Major recreational destinations include Mono Lake, the USFS Visitor Center, and SR 120 in Lee Vining Canyon. Bike routes exist to all these destinations.
	Most children at the schools in Lee Vining are bussed to school or walk. Commuting routes for school children are limited.
JUNE LAKE LOOP	Policies in the June Lake Area Plan focus on creating a more inviting and walkable community, and providing alternatives to automobile use. The June Lake Multimodal Plan addressed these concerns, and has since been incorporated directly into the RTP.
	The main bike route to and through June Lake is SR 158, a narrow, winding route without sufficient shoulders. This is an extremely popular touring route. Safety on this

	route is a concern, particularly for bicyclists between June Lake Village and the Down Canyon area.
	Public lands surrounding the June Lake Junction, and between June Lake and Mammoth Lakes, contain an extensive system of roads used by mountain bicyclists and off-highway vehicles. There are opportunities to link community bikeways to those roads. In addition, an alternative route parallel to US 395 could be provided between June Lake and Lee Vining. The USFS recently concluded a planning effort to highlight routes and eliminate duplicative paths of disturbance.
	Parking facilities for bicycles are limited in June Lake. Additional facilities could be provided in the Village and at the lakes.
	Share-the-road signs have been placed along North Shore Drive to enhance bicycle safety and use, and there is an opportunity to integrate bicycling amenities at the Rodeo Grounds/West Village and plan bike paths to access June Lake Ballfield, parks, and the lakes.
MAMMOTH VICINITY/ UPPER OWENS	The western portion of Long Valley is primarily a recreational area. There is no year-round residential development in the area. The area contains an extensive dirt road system, which is mapped in the Interagency OHV Maps. The Inyo National Forest has signed a few roads north of Casa Diablo and north of Mammoth Lakes as bike trails. Maps of those trails are available from the Forest. This is a very popular area with bicyclists; additional trail markings may be appropriate
	There is potential to connect trails in Mammoth Lakes with trails to the surrounding area by signing existing roads as bike trails.
LONG VALLEY	The Long Valley area includes the communities of Sunny Slopes/Tom's Place, Aspen Springs, Crowley Lake/Hilton Creek, McGee Creek, and Long Valley. These residential communities have limited commercial activities. Many of the residents work in Mammoth; most of the children go to school in Mammoth.
	Crowley Lake Drive, from Tom's Place to Long Valley, is used for biking by both residents and visitors. The County constructed a bike path along Crowley Lake Drive, from South Landing Road to the Community Library and Park.
	There are a number of recreational areas popular with bicyclists in and adjacent to Long Valley; i.e., Rock Creek Canyon, Owens Gorge Road, Convict Lake Road, and Benton Crossing Road. Rock Creek Canyon and Owens Gorge Road are accessible from the community areas along Crowley Lake Drive. Convict Lake Road and Benton Crossing Road are not accessible except by riding on US 395. Residents are interested in providing alternative routes to US 395. The Interagency OHV Maps show that an alternative route from Crowley Lake to the Convict Lake Road would be possible. An alternative route to Benton Crossing Road would not be possible.
	Benton Crossing Road is extremely popular with residents and visitors for bicycling. The Circulation Element/RTP contains a policy to designate a bike trail around Crowley Lake on Benton Crossing Road.
	The Circulation Element/RTP also contains a policy to designate a bike trail from Long Valley to Mammoth Lakes. Currently riders must use US 395. A loop from Mammoth Lakes to the Crowley area is another extremely popular bicycling route.
WHEELER CREST/ PARADISE	Wheeler Crest and Paradise are somewhat isolated residential areas. The only access road through the area, Lower Rock Creek Road, provides an alternative route to travel on US 395 between Long Valley and Bishop, as well as access to recreational areas along Lower Rock Creek. Lower Rock Creek Road is a narrow, 2-lane road. Residents are interested in providing a bikeway along Lower Rock Creek Road.
	There are limited rest facilities along Lower Rock Creek Road.
TRI-VALLEY	Bicyclists utilize SR 120 and US 6 in the Tri-Valley area (Benton, Hammil, and Chalfant) for touring or long day trips. Increased safety on those roads is a concern.
	Limited rest facilities (restrooms, water) are located at the community parks in Benton

	and Chalfant. There are no official turnouts along SR 120 and US 6.
	Chalfant has become a bedroom community for the city of Bishop, approximately 12 miles south in Inyo County. Residents have expressed an interest in developing a bike route between Chalfant and Bishop, either by widening the shoulder of US 6 or by developing an alternative route. Although many residents of Chalfant commute to Bishop to work, the potential for commuter bicycle use is not high. The distance involved, extreme hot and cold weather conditions throughout the year, and heavy winds do not make commuting by bicycle particularly attractive.
	There is a need for safe bike routes. These could be provided by widening the shoulders and designating a bike route or by designating an alternative route, particularly on Chalfant Road and Valley Road.
	Recreational bicycle use of the Tri-Valley area is limited. There is some interest in developing a bike route to Fish Slough. Another potential bike route is Chalfant Loop Road, connecting Chalfant with White Mountain Estates.
OASIS	Oasis is an isolated agricultural area; provision of bikeways has not been an issue.

4.3.2.11 Eastern Sierra Corridor Enhancement Program

The *Eastern Sierra Corridor Enhancement Plan* was developed in a collaboration of Caltrans, Mono County, Inyo County and Kern County to establish a unified vision for aesthetic enhancements for the Eastern Sierra Corridor with a focus on US 395 and SR 14. As part of the effort, the Plan included a detailed review of traffic conditions along the entire corridor, as summarized herein. The Eastern Sierra Corridor is not only a key element of the California surface transportation network, but also a key transportation corridor for Mono, Inyo, and Eastern Kern counties, and it serves as "Main Street" for the many communities it passes through. US 395 varies along the corridor from a four-lane divided freeway to a two-lane undivided conventional roadway, and speed limits vary from a maximum of 65 mph on most open roadway sections, to a minimum of 25 mph when passing through towns along the corridor.

The highest traffic volumes are in the Bishop area (south of Mono County), largely due to the high proportion of local traffic in Bishop. Overall, the data indicates relatively strong growth in traffic volumes on US 395 between Bishop and Mammoth Lakes. The ratio of peak month average daily traffic (ADT) to annual (ADT) has declined considerably over the last 10 years, indicating that volumes in the off seasons have increased faster than in the peak seasons.

Because it provides access to many recreational activities and destinations, the corridor experiences major traffic volume shifts throughout the year. From Lee Vining south, traffic in the northbound direction peaks on Fridays in both the summer and the winter (winter being significantly higher); southbound traffic peaks for both seasons on Sundays. North of Lee Vining the pattern changes: northbound and southbound traffic is very similar throughout the week, with winter traffic peaks on Friday, Saturday, and Sundays, and slightly lower volumes during summer. Recreational traffic creates specific problems due both to the amount and type of traffic. Peak days can resemble the recurrent congestion patterns found in more urban areas, posing particular concern in community areas. Additional safety concerns result from slow-moving recreational vehicles, particularly on two-lane sections of roadways.

The majority of accidents (about 67%) are single-vehicle accidents. Sideswipes, rear-ends, and broadsides were the next most common type of accidents. The most serious types of accidents (head-on, bicycle/vehicle, and pedestrian/vehicle) represented less than 2% each of the total. Although most of the analyzed highway segments have a fatality rate higher than the statewide average, the total accident rate is usually lower than average; this is attributed to higher speed single-vehicle accidents (such as running off the road).

Major planned improvements include expanding US 395 to four lanes from the San Bernardino County line to Lee Vining, with an LOS "B"; north of Lee Vining, LOS "C" will be accepted due to topographic constraints and lack of funding and public support. Other planned corridor improvements include widening shoulders, constructing passing lanes, and curve corrections. Many of the route concept improvements have already been completed.

US 395 provides regional transportation connections and truck access between southern California and Reno, Nevada. Trucks represent a higher-than-average proportion of the total traffic along the corridor, accounting for between 5% and 24% of total traffic; most locations have over 10% truck traffic. The majority of trucks have five or more axles and 23% have two axles. Corridor use for goods movement increased by 32% between 1997 and 2007. As Reno continues to develop the Tahoe Reno Industrial Center, additional increases in truck traffic can be anticipated; further studies are planned that will provide reliable estimates of impacts the new center may have on US 395.

The *Plan* notes that Caltrans and the Eastern Sierra communities have some competing interests when it comes to US 395 as Main Street. Caltrans' top priority is to improve safety, with additional concerns pertaining to reducing congestion, creating efficient traffic circulation, reducing maintenance, and reducing exposure to traffic for workers. In contrast, Eastern Sierra towns have repeatedly expressed a goal of slowing traffic, with improvements (median landscaping, roadside trees, traffic calming, sidewalk continuity, more crosswalks, etc.) that improve commercial activity and walkability in the community centers while addressing snow removal issues, maintaining highway capacity and allowing for the safe and efficient movement of freight and other vehicles. Caltrans is working with the local communities to identify design standards and improvement projects that are consistent with community values, provided they do not compromise sound engineering judgment and safety.

Lack of adequate parking is an issue in communities along the corridor, including parking for buses and large trucks (particularly in recreational and commercial areas). On-street parking can create safety concerns and hinder snow removal during winter. The plan suggests that community parking areas may be preferable to individual business parking areas, and cites a need to consider sites for large truck parking in communities such as Lee Vining and Bridgeport.

4.2.4 REGULATORY SETTING[6]

4.2.4.1 Federal Regulations

Federal National Environmental Policy Act. The National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA) is implemented by regulations included in the Code of Federal Regulations (40 CFR § 1500 et seq.), which require careful consideration of the harmful effects of federal actions or plans, including projects that receive federal funds, if they may have a significant adverse effect on the environment. NEPA mandates that all federal agencies carry out their regulations, policies, and programs in accordance with NEPA's policies of environmental protection. NEPA encourages the protection of all aspects of the environment and requires federal agencies to utilize a systematic, interdisciplinary approach to agency decision-making that will ensure the integrated use of natural sciences such as geology. While NEPA compliance is not required for the project, NEPA compliance will be required for transportation improvement projects that will be financed using federal funds. Some development projects (such as low-income housing) also use federal funds and are subject to NEPA. The regulations also require projects requiring NEPA review to seek to avoid or minimize adverse effects of proposed actions, and restore and enhance environmental quality as much as possible.

Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century (MAP-21). MAP-21 (signed into law by President Obama on 6 July 2012) provides over $105 billion of funding for surface transportation programs for fiscal years (FY) 2013 and 2014, and is the first long-term highway authorization enacted since 2005. By transforming the policy and programmatic framework for investments to guide the system's growth and development, MAP-21 creates a streamlined and performance-based surface transportation program and builds on many of the highway, transit, bike, and pedestrian programs and policies established earlier. To allow more time for development and consideration of a long-term reauthorization of surface transportation programs, Congress has enacted short-term extensions of the expiring law.

US Department of Homeland Security (DHS). DHS was established by the Homeland Security Act of 2002. The primary mission of the DHS is to; 1) prevent terrorist attacks in the United States; 2) reduce vulnerability of the US to terrorism; and 3) minimize damage and assist in the recovery from terrorist attacks that do occur.

[6] The reader is also referred to the interrelated regulations outlined in EIR §4.3, Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Emissions.

Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA). FEMA became a department of the DHS during 2003. The primary mission of FEMA is to protect the nation from all hazards (including natural and human-created disasters and acts of terrorism) and reduce the loss of life and property through a risk-based, comprehensive emergency management system of preparedness, protection, response, recovery, and mitigation.

National Response Framework (NRF). The NRF offers a set of guiding principles that enable all response partners to prepare for and provide a unified national response to disasters and emergencies. It establishes a comprehensive, national, all-hazards approach to domestic incident response. An earlier program (the National Response Plan) was replaced by the NRF in March 2008.

Transportation Security Administration (TSA). The TSA is a component of the DHS, responsible for security of the nation's transportation systems. TSA works with state, local and regional partners to provide security for highways, railroads, buses, mass transit systems, and ports. A majority of TSA resources are directed to aviation security (particularly passenger & baggage screening). In Mono County, TSA operates facilities at Mammoth Yosemite Airport.

The Disaster Mitigation Act of 2000 (DMA 2000). DMA 2000 provides an opportunity for states, tribes, and local governments to revitalize mitigation planning efforts. DMA 2000 amended the 1988 Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief & Emergency Assistance Act by adding §322 (Mitigation Planning), which required governments to develop and submit mitigation plans as a condition for funding through the Hazard Mitigation Grant Program (HMGP).

National Incident Management System (NIMS). NIMS provides a tool to help states, counties, and local jurisdictions respond to catastrophic events through enhanced communication and coordination, based on a nationwide response template. In California, the Standard Emergency Management System (SEMS) offers similar management tools (see §4.2.4.2, State Regulations).

United States Department of Defense (DOD). The DOD is authorized to provide resources when response and recovery requirements are beyond the capabilities of civilian authorities, provided that the DOD efforts do not compromise the Department's core mission of national defense. Requests for Defense Support can be submitted by local, county and state authorities, and generally follow or occur in tandem with a request from a Governor to the President for a disaster declaration. DOD operates one installation in Mono County (the Marine Corps Mountain Warfare Training Center, located south of Topaz).

4.2.4.2 State Regulations

California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). CEQA, enacted by the California legislature in 1970, is codified in the Public Resources Code starting at § 21000 (see http://www.ceres.ca.gov/topic/env_law/ceqa/stat). CEQA was closely modeled on NEPA, and both acts were conceived for the purpose of requiring public agencies and elected decision-makers to consider and disclose to the public the environmental implications of their actions. Unlike NEPA, CEQA requires the adoption of mitigation measures or project alternatives to avoid or mitigate significant adverse environmental effects (unless such measures are found to be infeasible). Through these requirements, CEQA establishes both a procedural obligation to analyze and publicize adverse physical environmental effects, and a substantive obligation to mitigate or avoid significant impacts

California Transportation Commission (CTC) RTP Guidelines.[7] CGC §65080 et seq. requires the preparation of RTPs, and the update of those plans at least every four years. §14522 authorizes the CTC to prepare guidelines to assist in the preparation of RTPs. The RTP guidelines prepared by CTC in turn encourage all areas to follow the federally mandated comprehensive planning process to ensure uniform plans statewide. The guidelines also recommend that RTP projections be based on available data, use acceptable forecasting methodologies, and be consistent with Department of Finance (DOF) projections for the planning region. The guidelines require an RTP to identify and discuss differences (if any) between the agency and DOF projections. The most recent update to the RTP guidelines was published in 2010,

[7] Caltrans website: http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/transprog/ocip/archives/stip2014/2014_itip.pdf, accessed 2-5-15.

with new provisions for complying with Senate Bill 375 (SB375, discussed below), and new guidelines for regional travel demand modeling, scaled to reflect differences in the size of California metropolitan planning organizations (MPOs).

State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP). STIP is a multi-year capital improvement program of transportation projects on and off the State Highway System, funded with revenues from the federal Transportation Investment Fund and other funding sources. STIP programming generally occurs every two years. The programming cycle begins with release of a proposed fund estimate (to identify the amount of new funds available for the programming of transportation projects), followed by CTC adoption of the fund estimate. Once the fund estimate is adopted, Caltrans works with regional planning agencies to prepare and submit transportation improvement plans for CTC review and approval. Implementation begins once projects are programmed. In 1997, the California STIP process was amended by Senate Bill 45, which divided STIP into two sub-programs: the 75% Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP) and the 25% Interregional Transportation Improvement Program (ITIP).

Caltrans' Interregional Transportation Improvement Program (ITIP).[8] ITIP is a program that funds projects to improve interregional mobility on California highways and rail corridors of strategic importance. The ITIP complements congestion-reduction activities in urban areas of the state that are funded by the Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP) and other funds. ITIP priorities include projects to improve state highways, projects to improve intercity passenger rail systems; and projects to improve interregional movement of people, vehicles, and goods. Projects selected for ITIP funding must be consistent with Caltrans' Interregional Transportation Strategic Plan (ITSP) and the CTC STIP Guidelines. The 2014 ITIP is a five-year program of projects through 2018-19 that will be funded by 25% of new STIP revenues. The 2014 ITIP Transportation Enhancements Program focuses on three broad categories including: a) transportation enhancements (including deletion of all 21 projects slated for FY 2014-2015 in order to return roughly $52 million to the interregional program per federal MAP-21 changes); b) a highway program whereby nearly $310 million will be directed to 16 projects on priority interregional corridors of greatest interregional value. In each case the projects will add segments to larger corridor improvements or completely close gaps within a corridor; and (c) the intercity rail program, wherein roughly $47 million will be directed to nine new intercity rail projects, all of which are consistent with the State Rail Plan and support the Strategic Business Plans for each of the intercity rail corridors. ITIP served as the long-range highway improvement program for the Mono County RTP.

Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS). MPOs (Metropolitan Planning Organizations) are required to incorporate an SCS into their RTP to establish a process for meeting emissions-reduction goals. The SCS integrates land use and transportation planning programs as a way of reducing GHG emissions, and uses smart growth planning concepts to focus housing and transportation projects in areas that are near jobs, shopping, and schools.

Mono County is not an MPO, and therefore is not required to develop and implement a Sustainable Communities Strategy as part of the RTP. However, Mono County has long sought to focus development in existing communities and to work with existing transportation facilities, and has taken an equally proactive stance toward achieving reductions in GHG emissions. The Mono County RTP carries these long-standing policies into the future, with strengthened emphasis on developing a multi-modal transportation system that serves the needs of residents and visitors while protecting natural resources and reducing GHG emissions. SCS topics are addressed in the Mono County General Plan, and in the Resource Efficiency Plan.

Efficient regional development is also supported by the draft Mono County Regional Blueprint and the Eastern Sierra Landownership Adjustment Project. The draft Regional Blueprint is a collaborative planning process for regional growth management and a coordinated approach to transportation planning. The Blueprint includes a long-range vision, guiding principles, and an implementation strategy for multi-modal transportation that can be implemented through the General Plan. The Eastern Sierra Landownership Adjustment Project (LAP) notes that lack of privately owned land both protects and constrains Mono County; the LAP vision statement emphasizes collaboration as a means to create landownership patterns that complement regional goals while protecting private property rights in order to achieve compact communities, adequate workforce housing, continued agricultural opportunities, protection of resources, and consolidation of lands managed by public agencies.

[8]Caltrans Division of Transportation Programming, *2014 Interregional Transportation Improvement Program* December 15, 2013.

Standard Emergency Management System (SEMS). SEMS is the California version of the federal NIMS program. SEMS is mandated under CGC §8607(a), and California Executive Order S205 requires the state to integrate NIMS into SEMS where and as appropriate.

Transportation Development Act (TDA).[9] The California TDA provides two major sources of funding for public transportation: the Local Transportation Fund (LTF), and the State Transit Assistance fund (STA). Both funds support the development of public transportation to meet needs in California, and both are allocated to areas of each county based on population, taxable sales and transit performance. Some counties have the option of using LTF for local streets and roads projects, if they can show there are no unmet transit needs. The branch provides oversight of the public hearing process used to identify unmet transit needs, and also provides interpretation of and initiates changes or additions to legislation and regulations concerning all aspects of the TDA. The branch also provides training and documentation regarding TDA statutes and regulations, and works to ensure that local planning agencies complete performance audits as required for TDA participation.

4.2.4.3 Local Regulations

Mono County LTC.[10] The LTC is Mono County's designated Regional Transportation Agency. The LTC is comprised of three board members appointed by Mammoth Lakes Town Council and three appointed by the Mono County Board of Supervisors, as well as the director of Caltrans District 9. The LTC acts autonomously in fulfilling the mandates of the TDA and other transportation-related state statutes. Primary LTC duties include preparation of an RTP every four years, preparation every two years of a Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP) for submittal to Caltrans and the CTC, review and comment on the STIP Transportation Improvement Plan, ongoing administration of TDA funds, preparation of an annual Overall Work Program, and funding allocation for Transportation Alternatives (TA).

Coordinated Public Transit Plans.[11],[12] Sponsored by Caltrans, the 2008 Coordinated Public Transit-Human Services Transportation Plan for Inyo and Mono counties was part of a larger planning effort for 23 non-urbanized counties. An Existing Conditions Report was prepared during phase one that described transportation services and programs and identified service gaps and needs. The second phase focused on identification of strategies and solutions to mitigate service gaps and implement the strategies. The Final Report encompasses results and findings from both phases. Plan preparation allowed Inyo and Mono counties to qualify as eligible for Federal Transit Administration (FTA) funding sources that require a coordinated plan. The Plan includes a needs assessment and projects to improve the mobility of disabled, elderly, and low-income residents. ESTA updated the Plan in 2014 in order to develop and refine existing implementable strategies that increase mobility for individuals with disabilities, older adults, and people with low incomes through public and stakeholder input for the period of 2014 to 2019. The strategies update the current Coordinated Public Transit-Human Services Transportation Plan and involve the public transit operator (ESTA), private transportation providers, nonprofit transportation providers or tribal transportation providers.

Eastern Sierra Transit Authority (ESTA) Short-Range Transit Plan (SRTP).[13] In 2008, public transportation services in Inyo and Mono counties transitioned from Inyo Mono Transit to the ESTA. ESTA provides a wide range of local, regional and interregional service (CREST) extending from Reno, Nevada to Lancaster, California with connections to the Los Angeles area. Dial-a-Ride services are provided in Mammoth, Bishop, Lone Pine and Walker. The 2009 SRTP was prepared as a first Short-Range Transit Plan for ESTA. Plan objectives are to guide the development of public transportation services in Inyo and Mono counties over one five-year period. The Plan incorporates public input, establishes goals and performance standards, documents transit needs, provides service plan recommendations,

[9] Caltrans website: http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/MassTrans/State-TDA.html, accessed 2-3-15.
[10] Mono County LTC website: http://www.monocounty.ca.gov/ltc, accessed 2-3-15.
[11] Inyo County LTC and Mono County LTC, *Inyo-Mono Counties Coordinated Public Transit-Human Services Transportation Plan*, prepared by Nelson Nygaard, October 2008.
[12] ESTA, *Inyo-Mono Counties Coordinated Public Transit – Human Services Transportation Plan Update,* Final Plan dated April 2014. Prepared by LSC Transportation Consultants, Inc.
[13] ESTA Short Range Transit Plan, Vol 1-Service & Financial Plan Final Report Jan. 2009, prepared by Transit Resource Center/Transit Marketing.

establishes a detailed operating and capital financial plan, and (in Volume II) provides a comprehensive marketing plan. The 2009 plan is currently being updated by ESTA.

Yosemite Area Regional Transit System (YARTS) Short-Range Transit Plan (SRTP).[14] YARTS provides public transit services in all areas of the three counties served, including Mono, Mariposa and Merced counties. The YARTS SRTP was prepared to guide development of the YARTS over a five-year period. Plan components were based on extensive market research, and include goals and performance standards, a comprehensive marketing plan, institutional options to improve the governance of YARTS (including potential expansion of the areas served), service plan recommendations, and a detailed operating and capital financial plan. YARTS services in Mono County are limited to the summer months, and include routes to Mammoth Lakes, June Lake, Lee Vining, and Tuolumne Meadows and Yosemite Valley within Yosemite National Park.[15]

Mono County Transit Plan. Specific purposes of the Mono County Transit Plan were to analyze existing transit services and to provide a concise summary of those services, to evaluate the needs of county residents and visitors for transit services, to estimate future demand for transit services, to evaluate funding opportunities to sustain the long-term viability of the transit system, and to delineate policies for the future development and operation of transit systems in the county. Since adoption of the Transit Plan, the Mono County Transit Service has expanded its routes in response to needs identified in the Plan and at annual unmet transit needs hearings. Note that ESTA's SRTP (discussed directly above) has superseded the Mono County Transit Plan (which is no longer maintained by the County); the SRTP will soon be again updated.

4.2.5 SIGNIFICANCE CRITERIA

Appendix G of the California CEQA Guidelines offer the following six criteria for determining the significance of transportation impacts. A project would have a potentially significant impact on circulation if it would:

a) **Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit;**
b) **Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways;**
c) **Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks;**
d) **Result in inadequate emergency access or design hazards; and**
e) **Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, parking or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities.**

4.2.6 ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS AND MITIGATING POLICIES AND ACTIONS

IMPACT 4.2(a): Would implementation of the proposed RTP/General Plan Update conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?

[14] Yosemite Area Regional Transit (YARTS) Short Range Transit Plan (SRTP), Volume I: Service, Institutional and Financial Plan, Final Report, March 2011, prepared by Transit Resource Center/Transit Marketing.
[15] YARTS bus routes and stop locations, YARTS website (http://www.yarts.com/service.html), accessed 2-3-1.

NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT. Traffic demand projections for the unincorporated areas of Mono County are presented in Table 4.2-7. The modest increases in forecast traffic demand reflect the fact that policies in the Mono County Land Use Element focus future growth in and adjacent to existing communities, particularly the unincorporated communities in Antelope Valley, Bridgeport Valley, June Lake, Wheeler Crest/Paradise, the Tri-Valley, and Long Valley.

TABLE 4.2-7: Five-Year Traffic Demand Projections, Mono County

	Estimated Avg. Vehicle Trips	Estimated Peak Hour Vehicle Trips	Estimated % Increase over current ADT
Antelope Valley	334.2	35.7	1.5 %
Bridgeport Valley	330.4	35.2	1.2 %
Mono Basin	120.8	12.9	2.5 %
June Lake	271.4	27.7	14.5 %
Long Valley	328.8	33.9	4.9 %
Tri-Valley	172.5	18.6	9.8 %

As shown, ADT levels are forecast to increase between a low of 1.2% (in the Bridgeport Valley) to a high of 14.5% (in June Lake). The RTP analysis notes that these estimated increases over current Average Daily Traffic (ADT) figures are not significant; the performance conditions on local streets are not generally a concern since those streets generally carry only local traffic. North Shore Drive into June Lake is expected to help mitigate the larger expected traffic increase in June Lake.

State and federal highways serve as the main access to each community in the county and carry the greatest amount of traffic. The General Plan Land Use Element calls for future County development to occur in and adjacent to existing communities that are served by existing highway systems. The RTP indicates that the continued (though decreasing, per 2010 Census data) separation of jobs and housing will result in increased traffic volumes, particularly on US 395 in the southern part of the county (including June Lake, Mammoth Lakes, Crowley Lake and Wheeler Crest). Recreational travel is also anticipated to increase, creating congested traffic patterns and safety concerns. Local communities seek to maintain livability while providing for smoothly flowing traffic and safe traffic speeds. Increased recreational travel will create need for additional specialized transportation facilities including pedestrian and bicycle facilities, turnouts/vista points, rest areas, information kiosks, and parking for recreational vehicles. Short-term roadway construction or rehabilitation projects are limited to those already included in the STIP. The long-term improvement projects include major rehabilitation projects to bring all roads to structural adequacy within 20 years. No new road facilities are proposed.

Performance conditions on state and federal highways are set by Caltrans systems planning. In District 9, Caltrans has placed the highest emphasis on maintaining and improving the interregional transportation network. Table 4.2-2 (in the baseline overview) showed Caltrans' planned LOS (LOS, see Key Terms in §4.2.2) for state and federal highways in Mono County. As indicated therein, most County highways have been assigned a D LOS (i.e., minimal delays but potentially restricted speeds and maneuverability).

The County works collaboratively with Caltrans on regional transportation planning (and Caltrans was a key participant in development of the RTP), but has no authority over the state highway system.[16] Caltrans is working to increase capacity on US 395, the route on which performance conditions are most affected by traffic levels. The RTP anticipates that performance conditions on US 395 and the other county highways will remain as shown above with periodic

[16] Source: Caltrans, OSFP Information and Procedures Guide, 1-2 Roles and Responsibilities, June 2002; Caltrans' Project Development Procedures Guide notes that all improvements to State highways are considered to be Caltrans projects, even where a project will be financed by others. Caltrans is responsible for operation, maintenance, system expansion and for assessing the impact of improvements proposed by others to the existing system. All project planning, design, right of way acquisition, and construction should be performed in accordance with Caltrans standards and practices and according to Caltrans project development process.

reevaluation as new performance measures are established and LOS alternatives are identified. The Draft RTP recommends three actions that pertain directly to effective performance of the County circulation system:

- Direct county Road Department funds to the operation and maintenance of existing roadways. Roadway construction or rehabilitation projects are limited to those eligible and included in the STIP. Both the RTIP and the STIP now include a preventive maintenance program.
- The County's action programs for bicyclists, pedestrians, equestrians, cross country skiers and other non-motorized modes of transportation focus on implementing existing trail and bicycle planning programs and on future adoption of a BTP. RTP policies call for the provision of wider shoulders for bike and other uses as a component of rehabilitation projects on streets and highways.
- Ensure active and continuous involvement in the STIP process to maximize funding opportunities for rehabilitation and construction projects throughout the county.

The recommended actions will improve and maintain conditions on local roads, expand non-motorized transportation options, and maximize funding for transportation rehabilitation and construction projects. As stated above, the RTP finds that local roads do not have generally adverse performance conditions, and concludes that anticipated increases over current ADT will not be significant. The adverse environmental effects on air quality, traffic, public safety and noise associated with construction, operation and maintenance of the planned roadway maintenance and rehabilitation facilities will be largely temporary in nature, and projects will be subject to separate CEQA review at the time that individual projects are proposed for implementation to assess site-specific environmental conditions and incorporate mitigations as required. Long-term, the proposed road and highway maintenance and rehabilitation improvements will improve traffic conditions and provide for increased public safety.

In combination with the policies and actions recommended in the RTP, it is concluded that adoption and implementation of the RTP/General Plan update would enable Mono County to continue with implementation of plans and programs that mitigate existing transportation issues and concerns, allow future transportation needs to be better served than would otherwise occur, and avoid some transportation and circulation issues altogether through preventive planning. ***No significant adverse impacts*** are foreseen with respect to applicable transportation plans, ordinances or policies. Applicable goals, policies and objectives recommended in the draft RTP (summarized in Table 4.2-10) will provide additional tools for maintaining effective performance of the Mono County circulation system.

RTP/GENERAL PLAN POLICIES AND ACTIONS THAT STRENGTHEN CIRCULATION SYSTEM PERFORMANCE

Please refer to Table 4.2-10 in EIR Appendix D.

IMPACT 4.2(b): Would implementation of the proposed RTP/General Plan Update conflict with an applicable congestion plan including but not limited to LOS standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?

LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT. Overall, the transportation system in Mono County does not experience severe congestion except in limited areas, and at limited times. The RTP notes that recreational traffic creates specific problems for both the interregional and local circulation system, due both to the amount and type of that traffic. Travel demands during peak winter ski weekends can simulate the recurrent congestion patterns found in more-urban areas; summer recreational events also create congestion (particularly in community areas) as well as safety concerns resulting from slow-moving recreational vehicles (particularly on two-lane roadway sections).

Caltrans systems planning documents provide existing and long-range levels of service for those routes and proposed improvements. Table 4.2-8 above shows Caltrans' planned LOS for state and federal highways in Mono County. Caltrans has been working to increase capacity on US 395, the route on which performance conditions are most

affected by traffic levels. However, the RTP notes that performance conditions on Mono County's highway system will remain as shown previously in Table 4.2-2 (Caltrans Systems Planning Route Concepts).

The Caltrans Dist. 9 System Management Plan[17] states that a primary transportation improvement focus for the District and its regional transportation planning agencies is the "*continued upgrade of the US 395/SR 14 corridor to a modern four-lane access controlled expressway. Improving safety for all users while balancing the State Highway's role as interregional thoroughfare, local lifeline, goods movement corridor, and community main street is one of the biggest challenges the District faces."* The RTP concludes that performance conditions on the County's highway system will remain as shown in Table 4.2-2 but will be revaluated by Caltrans (including CEQA analysis) following issuance of new guidance regarding performance measures and LOS alternatives.

Due to a number of factors, many types of Transportation Demand Management (TDM) measures (i.e., measures to reduce vehicle trips, lengths and congestion) are not viable in many unincorporated areas of Mono County. Bicycling and walking are generally not a year-round option for commuters due to the long distances traveled and severe winter weather conditions. Transit services for commuter and demand management purposes are similarly limited by the distance between destinations and the relatively small population base.

However, TDM has proved to be a viable option for addressing recreational transportation demands, which is identified as the problem most affecting congestion in Mono County. Shuttle service to Reds Meadow Valley (including the Devils Postpile National Monument) has been in place for many years in order to reduce traffic impacts, and the expanding YARTS program now provides shuttle service from Lee Vining to Yosemite Valley and Tuolumne Meadows – both popular tourism destinations. The RTP notes that recent technological advances, such as Digital 395, may also contribute to transportation demand management. As more people are able to conduct their business electronically via the Digital 395 broadband middle-mile telecommunications networks, commuter travel demand should decrease.

Apart from recreational uses, parking also contributes to circulation challenges in many Mono County communities, as described in Table 4.2-4 (see §4.2.3.7 above), most notably Bridgeport, Bodie, Mono Basin and June Lake. The county General Plan Land Development Regulations generally require on-site parking for single-family residences (two spaces per unit) and other uses where requirements are based on the intensity of use. Most parking in commercial areas is uncovered, and the County has in recent years revised its parking requirements to allow greater flexibility in meeting parking requirements in central business districts. These modifications have allowed the County to effectively respond to parking issues and needs in Bridgeport, and future Complete Street/Main Street planning in June Lake and Lee Vining will alleviate parking issues in those communities as well.

The Draft RTP recommends three actions that pertain directly to the management of congestion in the County circulation system:

- Caltrans' Interregional Improvement Program (IIP) will continue to serves as the long-range highway improvement program for this RTP, and
- The current adopted STIP for Mono County will continue to serve as the short-range highway improvement program. In the past, STIP projects have been confined to highway projects. Since the passage of SB 45, STIP funds are available for a variety of transportation improvement projects. As a result, although the STIP contains primarily highway projects, it also contains projects on County and Town roads, as well as pedestrian and bikeway improvements, and transit projects. These are specific action items to be completed in the immediate future. General action plans, both short-term and long-term, for County and Town roads, aviation, pedestrian facilities, and bikeway facilities are outlined in this RTP.
- Ensure active and continuous involvement in the STIP process to maximize funding opportunities for rehabilitation and construction projects throughout the county.

Use of Caltrans' IIP program will focus on improvements to the long-range highway program and acknowledges that Mono County has no direct authority over the state highway system. As noted previously, Caltrans District 9 has placed

[17] Caltrans, *District System Management Plan, District 9*, March 2015.

the highest emphasis on maintaining and improving the interregional transportation network, and has indicated its goal to increase capacity on US 395. Even with Caltrans improvements, however, the RTP anticipates that performance conditions on US 395 and the other County highways will remain generally as at present. As summarized in the baseline overview (§4.2.3.6), the RTP discusses safety concerns associated with truck traffic. The concerns focus on: a) the impact of oversized trucks on the safety of two-lane highway sections; b) the lack of paved shoulders and adequate sight distances; c) hazardous conditions that occur when vehicles must pull over on narrow shoulders for emergencies; and d) hazards to bicyclists when passed by large trucks, particularly where shoulders are narrow. The *RTP* notes that recent four-laning of US 395 in various parts of the county has mitigated safety issues in those areas, but concerns about truck traffic remain significant in the Tri-Valley on US 6, a two-lane road with no shoulders. The *RTP* further indicates that recreational vehicle traffic poses safety concerns similar to those noted for trucks.

THE RTP recommends use of the current adopted STIP program to guide short-range highway improvements in Mono County, coupled with active and continuous involvement in that process in order to maximize funding opportunities. The regional funding can be applied to a wide range of projects including highways, aviation, road enhancements, public transportation, rail, bicycle and pedestrians, and highway safety. Issues that most affect congestion on Mono County highways include peak-season recreational travel demands (including highway safety concerns from slow-moving vehicles, particularly on two-lane road segments) as well as parking demand. As indicated in the Regulatory Setting discussion, 75% of STIP funding is now set aside to fund regional transportation improvements. Implementation of the RTP-recommended actions would enable Mono County to continue with implementation of plans and programs that will minimize existing congestion and respond more effectively to increased future demands. Adoption and implementation of the proposed RTP/General Plan Update, as outlined herein, would have a beneficial effect on LOS standards, travel demand measures, and other standards established to manage congestion in Mono County, and impacts are expected to be ***less than significant***. Applicable goals, policies and objectives recommended in the draft RTP (summarized in Table 4.2-10) will provide additional tools for maintaining effective performance of the Mono County circulation system.

RTP/GENERAL PLAN POLICIES AND ACTIONS THAT SUPPORT CONGESTION MANAGEMENT

Please refer to Table 4.2-10 in EIR Appendix D.

IMPACT 4.2(c): Would implementation of the RTP/General Plan Update result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?

NO IMPACT. Land use surrounding airports in Mono County is reviewed by the Airport Land Use Commission (ALUC), which has adopted Comprehensive Land Use Plans (CLUPs) for all airports in the county. The RTP notes that general aviation aircraft activity (including aircraft used for firefighting, emergency services, charter service, business and/or recreation) plays an important role in Mono County and the Eastern Sierra region.

Most aviation activity occurs at Mammoth Yosemite Airport, which is owned and managed by the Town of Mammoth Lakes. Service demands at Mammoth Yosemite Airport are forecast to grow in coming years. In contrast, the Mono County RTP does not anticipate that aviation demands at Bryant Field and Lee Vining airports (both of which are managed by Mono County) will increase beyond current levels. Between 2015 and 2020, the Mono County RTP forecasts that the number of aircraft based at Bryant Field and Lee Vining will remain at four for each facility (all single-engine). Annual aircraft operations are also forecast to remain at current levels through 2020 (including 4,500 operations annually at Bryant Field, and 2667 at Lee Vining). Flight activity at both facilities will continue to be centered exclusively on general aviation, with no anticipated change in flight distribution or the ratio of instrument to visual flight operations.

The California Aviation System Plan (CASP) identifies all the airports in Mono County as ones considered to be the Eastern Sierra's highest priority facilities in terms of system capacity and safety enhancement. The CASP suggests needed safety improvements at all of the County's airports. The RTP notes that operational and safety improvements planned at Bryant Field and the Lee Vining Airport will respond to the CASP recommendations, and are included in the short-term capital improvement programs for Bryant Field and the Lee Vining Airport.

The Draft RTP recommends two actions that pertain directly to the Lee Vining and Bridgeport air facilities:

- The Lee Vining and Bridgeport (Bryant Field) airports are operated by the County. The County has updated the airport plans for these airports. An increase in transient activity is expected at the Lee Vining Airport due to a new emphasis on its proximity to Yosemite National Park; and
- Short-range action plans for the Lee Vining Airport and Bryant Field in Bridgeport are provided by the Capital Improvement Plan for each airport and include a number of safety improvements.

Although the recommended actions reference an increase in transient activity at Lee Vining Airport due to new emphasis on proximity to Yosemite National Park, RTP Table 11 (Aircraft and Operations Forecast, Lee Vining Airport, 2000-2020) indicates that whereas operations increased at both Lee Vining and Bryant Field during the period from 2005 to 2010 (a 33% increase in single-engine aircraft operations at both facilities), no additional increase is forecast to occur over the coming five-year period through 2020.

Adoption and implementation of the RTP/General Plan Update is expected to have ***no significant adverse effects*** on air traffic patterns at either County-operated facility, nor will it cause an increase in air traffic levels or a change in the location of air activity. Moreover, the actions recommended in the RTP for Lee Vining and Bryant Field airports include implementation of Capital Improvement Plans that recommend safety improvements for both facilities, as well as funding to update comprehensive plans for these airports that will extend beyond the 2020 horizon of the RTP to account for future increases in airport demand and associated improvement requirements. Applicable goals, policies and objectives recommended in the draft RTP will provide additional tools for maintaining effective performance of the Mono County circulation system.

RTP/GENERAL PLAN POLICIES AND ACTIONS THAT SUPPORT AIR TRAFFIC SAFETY

Please refer to Table 4.2-10 in EIR Appendix D.

IMPACT 4.2(d): Would implementation of the proposed RTP/General Plan Update result in inadequate emergency access or design hazards?

LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT. The Mono County EOP outlines how emergency workers should respond to major emergencies within the county. The plan links detailed standard operating procedures (SOPs) at the local level to broader state and federal disaster planning. The EOP also addresses potential transportation-related hazards in Mono County (including earthquakes, volcanic eruptions, floods, and hazardous materials transport), as well as emergency preparedness and emergency response for the regional transportation system, including the identification of emergency routes. The County also consults with Cal Fire for emergency access requirements for new development in the State Responsibility Areas that cover most of the private property in Mono County. Ongoing GIS mapping will further enhance and support alternative route awareness for emergency response and incident location.

The RTP notes that terrain and land ownership patterns generally limit alternative access routes in Mono County to the existing street and highway system, and limited circulation is cited as a potential limiting factor for local emergency services and for evacuations. US 395 serves as the main corridor for emergency purposes, and the County has developed alternative access routes for some community areas with limited access, including North Shore Drive in June Lake, and the Mammoth Scenic Loop north of Mammoth Lakes. Recently, signs have been installed on the June Lake

Loop as part of the 911 emergency response program. However, some of the loop roads lack proper grading, shoulders, setback and design features, and these limitations pose potential constraints to effective emergency vehicle access. As summarized in Table 4.2-4 (Circulation and Parking Issues in Mono County Communities), other Mono County communities with identified emergency response and access issues include Long Valley and the Tri-Valley area.

Maintenance of non-paved roads will extend the area that can be safely accessed by emergency response vehicles, and thereby contribute to enhanced service. Emergency access needs will also be addressed through other RTP-recommended actions that will improve circulation and provide alternate access routes, both of which are limiting factors for emergency access.

Improved emergency response is the subject of a number of goals, policies and actions recommended in the draft RTP as summarized in Table 4.2-10. These initiatives will enhance emergency response throughout Mono County, and the *Draft RTP* includes specific policies and actions to provide or improve emergency response in the community areas where such services are currently lacking or below par. Adoption and implementation of the proposed RTP/General Plan update will have a *less than significant impact* on emergency services.

RTP/GENERAL PLAN POLICIES AND ACTIONS THAT SUPPORT EMERGENCY ACCESS

Please refer to Table 4.2-10 in EIR Appendix D.

IMPACT 4.2(e): Would implementation of the proposed RTP/General Plan Update conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, parking or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?

NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT: The RTP notes that transit-dependent populations in Mono County are generally young, senior, disabled and/or low-income residents. As shown in Table 4.2-8 below, the percentage of young people is projected to remain relatively stable over the next 20 years while the senior population is projected to rise over 100 percent over the same period. The senior population often has mobility concerns that require specialized transportation.

TABLE 4.2-8: Population Projections, Young People & Seniors

	2010	2020	2030
Under 17 years old	3004/ 21.0%	3011 / 19.9%	3921 / 18.0%
65 years or older	1429 / 10.0%	2637 / 17.4%	3981 / 24.5%
Total Population	14,338	15,147	16,252

The 2015 *Inyo-Mono Counties Coordinated Public Transit-Human Services Transportation Plan Update* prepared for ESTA offers a more detailed picture of transit-dependent populations in Mono County:

- The greatest number of persons over age 65 in Mono County lives in Mammoth Lakes (550);
- Mammoth also has the greatest number of persons living below poverty level (1,058), and a high number of seasonal workers;
- There are 75 households without a vehicle in Mammoth and 53 in June Lake;
- Data on residents with disabilities is not yet available from the 2010 Census;
- Most Mono County employment is in tourism sector or County government. Major employers in Mono County (more than 200 employees) include Mammoth Hospital, Mammoth Mountain Ski Area, and the County offices in Bridgeport and Mammoth;
- The median household income in Mono County is $60,469. Around 2.4% of households receive Supplemental Social Security, 1.2% received cash assistance, and 4.3% receive SNAP benefits;.
- Nearly 40% of Mono County employed residents work in Mammoth Lakes; 11.3% work in Crowley Lake, 7% commute to Bishop and 5.3% commute to Bridgeport. Almost 75% of employees working in Mammoth Lakes commute from elsewhere (mainly

from Bishop, Crowley Lake, Chalfant and June Lake). There is a high level of commuting between Bishop and Mammoth Lakes, with a greater number of commuters travelling from Bishop to Mammoth Lakes; and

- Population projections prepared by the California State Department of Finance forecast significant growth in older adults who will require access to medical and social services. The senior population (65+) is forecast to increase by 65% between 2010 and 2020, and by 130% between 2020 and 2030 when the increase will be largely comprised of residents age 75+.

State Law (AB 1358) requires local governments to include provisions for Complete Streets in their general plans, with specific reference to non-motor transportation options: "In order to fulfill the commitment to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, make the most efficient use of urban land and transportation infrastructure, and improve public health by encouraging physical activity, transportation planners must find innovative ways to reduce vehicle miles traveled (VMT) and to shift from short trips in the automobile to biking, walking and use of public transit." This theme is echoed in the Caltrans definition of a complete street as: "a transportation facility that is planned, designed, operated and maintained to provided safe mobility for all users, including bicyclists, pedestrians, transit vehicles, truckers, and motorists, appropriate to the function and context of the facility."

Consistent with State law (AB 1358), and as described in the RTP (of which it is a part), Mono County has been very proactive in the development of policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities. A key component of the County's efforts is the updated 2015 Mono County Trails Plan. The plan focuses on adopting a Bicycle Transportation Plan. RTP policies call for the provision of wider shoulders for bike and other uses as a component of rehabilitation projects on streets and highways, and focus on walkable communities and increasing multi-modal mobility in the Livable Communities and Active Transportation policy elements. This theme is echoed in the Caltrans definition of a complete street as: "a transportation facility that is planned, designed, operated and maintained to provide safe mobility for all users, including bicyclists, pedestrians, transit vehicles, truckers, and motorists, appropriate to the function and context of the facility." The Trails Plan expands upon and implements policies in the *Mono County General Plan*, associated area plans, and the *RTP*, and is coordinated with applicable plans of federal land management agencies. The Plan focuses primarily on the development of facilities for recreational users (both residents and visitors).

Mono County has also undertaken several "complete street' programs that focus on reducing vehicle miles traveled (VMT) by expanding opportunities for all users including bicyclists, pedestrians, transit vehicles, trucks, and motorists, appropriate to the function and context of the facility. Main Streets in most Mono County communities are also state highways, and must serve the needs of regional mobility as well as local safety and community values. The County has recently completed a Main Street Design Handbook for Bridgeport that includes pedestrian features (signage, lighting, seating and curb extensions), truck safety (via an innovative reconfiguration/reduction of travel lanes and parking spaces to slow traffic and provide for safer parallel and back-in angle parking options), and bicycle features (including bike racks). Similar design handbooks have been completed for other Main Streets (including Walker, Lee Vining and June Lake) in tandem with the Main Street Planning process. Working with Bridgeport Main Street business owners, the County has also prepared a new parking plan that incorporates back-in angle parking on Main Street (from School Street to the Jolly Kone crosswalk, and east of the Jolly Kone crosswalk to the bank's driveway on the north side of US 395) and parallel parking on both sides of Main Street (from School Street to the west and from approximately the Jolly Kone crosswalk to the east).

The *Draft RTP* includes the goal to partner with Caltrans to utilize Active Transportation Program funds, as well as continued use of Memoranda of Understanding (MOU) to support ongoing and planned transportation-related public/private partnerships in the county including: a) working with the CTC and Caltrans to cover a funding shortfall on the Freeman Gulch four-lane; b) initiating a collaborative regional transportation planning process with Kern, Inyo, and San Bernardino counties and Caltrans, including approval of a formal MOU to pool funds for high-priority STIP projects in the region; c) working with the Town of Mammoth Lakes to initiate a pavement management system to assist in identifying future rehabilitation projects on local road systems; d) improvements to North Conway and Bridgeport passing Lanes R14-09 (the North Conway passing lanes project is identified as a tier 1 priority in the *Draft RTP).* In addition to the activities above, the *RTP* recommends two actions that pertain directly to the implementation of policies, plans and programs supporting multi-modal transportation:

- The action plans for transit focus on implementing policies in the Inyo-Mono Counties Coordinated Transit plans, the ESTA Short-Range Transit Plan and YARTS (as well as the Town of Mammoth Lakes Transit Plan). Specific

purposes of these plans are to analyze existing transit services and provide a concise summary of those services, to evaluate the needs of county residents and visitors for transit services, to estimate future demand for transit services, to evaluate funding opportunities to sustain the long-term viability of the transit system, and to delineate policies for the future development and operation of transit systems in the county. Mono County transit services have expanded routes in response to the needs identified in these plans and at the annual unmet needs hearings; and

- Recommended actions that focus on interregional connections includes continuing participation in YARTS, in the inter-city transit planning process with Inyo and Kern counties and Caltrans District 9, and in the Eastern California Transportation Planning Partnership, which is a collaborative regional transportation planning process with Kern, Inyo, and San Bernardino counties.

The RTP recommendations, in combination with the many local and regional transit plans and initiatives undertaken to date, indicate that the proposed *General Plan* Update will have less than significant impacts (and is expected to have beneficial effects) on the adoption and implementation of policies, plans, and programs regarding public transit, bicycle, parking and pedestrian facilities. Applicable goals, policies and objectives recommended in the *draft RTP* (see Table 4.2-10) will provide additional tools for maintaining effective performance of the Mono County circulation system. Three additional recommendations are included below that reflect Caltrans' comments on the NOP.

The recently completed *BTP* states that demands fall into 4 categories that include:

1. Bicycle routes for residents and visitors for use as alternate transportation and commuting between camping areas, day use areas, commercial areas, and businesses and employment;
2. Bicycle routes for residents and visitors to Mono County for recreational use, sightseeing, and exercise; and
3. Safe bicycle routes in each community for children commuting to and from school and other activities.
4. Safe bicycle routes for long-distance riders on state and local highways and roadways.

Demand by residents for commuting routes is limited, and this is not expected to change. Weather conditions, topography and land use patterns in the county make it impractical for most people to commute to work on bicycles or for many students to commute to school using bicycles (students and workers often drive many miles to their commuting destination). In some areas, safety considerations limit the options for biking within communities since many routes cross highways or run alongside highways, often without adequate shoulders. For these reasons, increasing safety in and between communities, and providing connections between Mammoth Lakes and surrounding communities, would increase bicycling opportunities and demand.

The County notes that recreational use continues to increase, and recreational users are seeking a variety of biking opportunities, ranging from short, paved paths for family biking experiences, to long distance touring routes, and off-road experiences. The potential projects identified in the BTP recognize these needs and demands, and also provide for support facilities (secure and convenient bicycle parking, bike storage, signage, lighting, etc.), and multiple facility use where feasible. Popular touring routes traversing the entire county are also included, along with local routes focused in communities, and the BTP also incorporates education and safety programs geared toward visitors, touring bicyclists, enhanced signage and comprehensive mapping of facilities, routes and connections. Table 4.2-9 lists bicycle improvements proposed in the BTP for Mono County communities:

TABLE 4.2-9: BTP-Recommended Bicycle Improvements in Mono County Communities

FACILITY	TYPE	FROM	TO	NEED	RECOMMENDED IMPROVEMENTS	APPROX. DISTANCE	PRIORITY
ANTELOPE VALLEY							
Mountain Gate Park bike path	Class I	Eastside Lane	Mountain Gate Park	Connectivity, recreational opportunity	Class I facility, install bike racks	.5 Mile	M
Coleville schools	Class I	Marine Housing	Coleville Schools	Safe access to schools	Class I facility, install bike racks	1.5 Miles	H

network							
Antelope Valley loop	Class III	US 395 w/ east/west access on Topaz	Eastside Lane Larson, Cunningham	Recreational opportunity, connectivity, safety	Widen shoulders in designated areas, add signage	12 Miles	H
Information kiosks	-----	Along loop route		Education/tourism	1+ kiosks along the loop route that discuss natural setting and Valley history	-----	L
Eastside Lane bike lane	Class II	Eastside Lane	Larson, Topaz, Cunningham	Connectivity, recreational opportunity, safety	Class II	5 Miles	M
Bike racks	-----	Walker Park	-----	Recreational	Install bike racks at park	-----	
Directional signage	-----	US 395 north & south of access to park		Improve signage directing bicyclists to rest facilities at Community Center/Park	Install standard directional signs	-----	L
BRIDGEPORT VALLEY							
Twin Lakes Rd bike route	Class II	Main Street	Twin Lakes Resort	Recreational opportunity, safety	Expand shoulder – add shoulder stripes or bike lanes and signage	8 Miles	H
Bridgeport schools network	Class I	SR 182, Stock Dr., North School St.	Kingsley Street	Safe access to schools	Class I facility, install bike racks, bike crossing at US 395	.5 Mile	H
Bridgeport community network Evans Tract segment	Class I	South end of Evans Tract	Main Street	Connectivity, safety	Separate bike path above private property	2.5 Miles	M
Bridgeport community network Reservoir segment	Class I	Around reservoir connecting to bike lane along SR 182 to Main Street		Connectivity, recreational opportunities	Class I facility around reservoir	9 Miles	M
Bridgeport community network SR 182 segment	Class II	North end of reservoir	Main Street	Connectivity, safety	Expand shoulder – add shoulder stripes or bike lanes and signage	3 Miles	M
Bodie recreational loop	Dirt	US 395 to Bodie via SR 270, Cottonwood Canyon Rd, and SR 167		Recreational opportunity	Signage or map showing loop route	30 Miles	M
Bike racks	-----	At commercial and public buildings in Bridgeport community		Recreational	Work with businesses & public entities to install bike racks	-----	

Directional signage	-----	US 395 north & south of access to park		Improve signage directing bicyclists to rest facilities at Community Center/Park	Install standard directional signs	-----	L
MONO BASIN							
Lee Vining Canyon route	Class I	Lee Vining Cyn. Camp-grounds to Main St. via power line right of way		Connectivity, recreational opportunity	Class I facility	4 Miles	M
County Park access	Class II	Lee Vining	Mono County Park	Recreational Opportunities	Expand shoulders, add shoulder stripes or bike lanes, signage, crosswalk on US 395	1 Mile	L
Lee Vining schools network	Class II	Pahoa Drive	Lee Vining Elementary & Lee Vining High School	Safe access to schools	Expand shoulders, add shoulder stripes or bike lanes, signage, crosswalk on US 395	.5 Mile	M
Mono Lake trails network	Dirt	Network of Dirt Roads in the Mono Basin		Recreational opportunities	Signage, connector trails	>100 Miles	M
Bike racks	-----	Throughout Lee Vining		Recreational, commuting	Work with businesses and public entities to install additional bike racks	-----	H
SR 120E upgrades		Sage Hen Summit east to Benton Crossing Road		Safety	Maintenance Upgrades	45 Miles	M
Widen uphill shoulders	-----	SR 120 E from US 395 to Benton		Safety	Widen shoulders on uphill sections to improve safety	45 Miles	H
Directional signage	-----	US 395 north & south of access to park		Improve signage directing bicyclists to rest facilities Lee Vining Park	Install standard directional signs	-----	L
JUNE LAKE							
Silver Lake bike path	Class I	Silver Lake Camp-ground	Rest area on SR 158	Recreational, Safety	Construction of paved separated path on east side of SR 158	2 Miles	M
Bike racks		June Lake Village		Recreational, Commuter	Install bike racks	-----	M
Information kiosks		Along loop route		Education/tourism	Multiple kiosks along the loop route that discuss natural setting and the loop's history	-----	L
Staging facility		SR 158 & US 395 South Junction		Recreational	At visitor kiosk, add staging facilities for bicyclist; i.e., bathroom/lockers	-----	L
June Lake Loop bike route	Class III	Entire SR 158		Recreation, Safety, commuting	Class III facility	15 Miles	H
"Share the Road"	-----	June Lake Loop		Safety	Install standard signs	-----	H

signage							
LONG VALLEY							
Mammoth Lakes Crowley access trail	Class I	West end of Crowley Lake Drive	Mammoth Lakes	Connectivity, recreational opportunity	Class I facility utilizing existing dirt roads south of US 395	15 Miles	H
Crowley Lake bike loop	Class II	Benton Crossing Road, Owens Gorge Road, Crowley Lake Drive, South Landing Road		Recreational opportunity	Expand shoulders, add shoulder stripes or bike lanes, signage, crosswalk on US 6	20 Miles	M
Crowley Lake community network Crowley Lake Dr. segment	Class II	Tom's Place	Long Valley	Safety	Expand shoulders, add shoulder stripes or bike lanes, signage, crosswalk on US 6	5 Miles	H
Crowley Lake community network S. Landing Rd Segment	Class II	Crowley Lake Drive	Crowley Lake	Safety	Expand shoulders, add shoulder stripes or bike lanes, signage, crosswalk on US 6	2 Miles	H
Bike racks	-----	Throughout Crowley Lake		Recreational, local commuting	Work with businesses & public entities to install additional bike racks	-----	H
Bike route signage	-----	US 395 from Tom's Place to Lee Vining		Safety	Install standard signs	-----	H
"Share the Road" signage	-----	Crowley Lake Drive, Benton Crossing Road, Scenic Loop		Safety	Install standard signs	-----	H
Widen uphill shoulders	-----	Crowley Lake Drive, Benton Crossing Road, Scenic Loop		Safety	Widen shoulders on uphill sections to improve safety	-----	H
Directional signage	-----	Crowley Lake Drive, South Landing Road		Improve signage directing bicyclists to rest facilities at Community Center/Park	Install standard directional signs	-----	L
CHALFANT							
Community bike route	Class III	Chalfant west of US 6	Chalfant Park	Recreational, connectivity, safety	Expand shoulders, add shoulder stripes or bike lanes, signage, crosswalk on US 6	.5 Mile	H
Bike racks	-----	Chalfant Park	-----	Recreational	Install bike racks at park	-----	
Directional signage	-----	US 6 north & south of	access to park	Improve signage directing bicyclists to rest facilities at Chalfant Park	Install standard directional signs	-----	L
US 6 cattle guards	-----	Where applicable	-----	Bike-friendly cattle guards increase	Replace as funds are available	-----	M

				bicyclist safety			
Fish Slough bike route	Class III	US 6 at Chalfant	Fish Slough	Recreational opportunity	Expand shoulder – add shoulder stripes or bike lanes and signage	Undeter-mined	L
BENTON							
Community bike route	Class III	High Desert Academy	Benton Cmty Center Park	Recreational, connectivity, safety	Expand shoulders, add shoulder stripes or bike lanes, signage, crosswalk on US 6	1 Mile	H
Benton schools network	----	School		Infrastructure needs	Install bike racks	-----	M
Bike racks	-----	Benton Community Center / Park	-----	Recreational	Install bike racks at community center/park	-----	
Directional signage	-----	US 6 north & south	access to park	Improve signage directing bicyclists to rest facilities at Community Center/Park	Install standard directional signs	-----	L
US 6 cattle guards	-----	Where applicable	-----	Bike-friendly cattle guards increase bicyclist safety	Replace as funds are available	-----	M

The plans and programs outlined above for multi-modal transportation will increase alternative transit options for residents and visitors and expand the range and safety of facilities for bicyclists. The adverse environmental impacts on air quality, traffic, public safety and noise associated with construction, operation and maintenance of the planned facilities will be largely temporary in nature, and substantially outweighed by the long-term benefits to air quality, traffic, safety and noise associated with long-term use of the proposed multi-modal facilities. The County has taken several steps in response to Caltrans' NOP comment letter. Regarding the suggesting use of mitigation banking to address transportation project impacts, the County has included a policy in the Conservation/ Open Space Element that "*Projects shall be required to achieve "No Net Loss" through avoidance or minimization of impacts and compensation for unavoidable impacts in partnership with an established mitigation bank.* The RTP also incorporates a multi-modal concept, with Caltrans' involvement, and the *Draft LUE* includes a regulation (LUE, Chapter 11, 11.010.F.1) that requires a variance for installation of overhead utility lines in scenic corridors; for areas outside the scenic corridor, only a use permit is required. In consideration of the information presented herein, the project is concluded to have ***no significant adverse* impacts** on adopted multi-modal programs or on the performance or safety of such facilities.

RTP/GENERAL PLAN RECOMMENTATIONS, POLICIES AND ACTIONS THAT SUPPORT MULTI-MODAL TRANSPORTATION

Please refer to Table 4.2-10 in EIR Appendix D.

INSERT MITIGATING POLICIES TABLE 4.2-10 HERE